

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 14, 1931

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite God, our Father, for all the sweet memories of the past and for all the wholesome dreams of the future we thank Thee. May these be foretokens of a life that we shall live when we shall have passed beyond earth's voices into the realms of perfect rest. We praise Thee for the songs of cheer and immortal love, which are as pure as the dew of the morning and as sweet as its breath. Encourage our worthy endeavors, increase our passionate thirst for righteousness and our hatred for ignorance. Give dignity and poise to our deliberations, and continue to lead us in that pathway that offers us study and inspires us to a high standard of public service and social duties. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7998. An act to amend subsection (d) of section 11 of the merchant marine act of June 5, 1920, as amended by section 301 of the merchant marine act of May 22, 1928.

SULLYS HILL NATIONAL PARK

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

Mr. COLTON (when the Committee on the Public Lands was called). Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 8534) for the transfer of jurisdiction over Sullys Hill National Park from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture, to be maintained as the Sullys Hill National Game Preserve, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah calls up the bill H. R. 8534 and asks unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object; because this is a matter of such great importance, transferring jurisdiction from one department to another, that I think perhaps it ought to be done by unanimous consent—

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman withhold any request a moment? May I ask the gentleman, in all frankness, if it is his intention to continue with the filibuster during the day? I should like to know so that I may make arrangements to try to carry on the business of the House. Will the gentleman answer me fairly?

Mr. PARKS. Fairly? I will not only answer the gentleman fairly—

Mr. TILSON. Does the gentleman intend to continue the filibuster?

Mr. PARKS. Does the gentleman want me to answer?

Mr. TILSON. Yes; I should like to have an answer, because I should like to know how to proceed.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, I feel so greatly complimented by the gentleman's statement that whatever the gentleman asks me to do, I will be delighted to do.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman then hear my request?

Mr. PARKS. Absolutely; and I will abide by anything that the gentleman requests.

Mr. TILSON. I respectfully ask the gentleman to refrain from any further effort to delay the proceedings of the House; in other words, that he will not continue the filibuster in which he has been engaged for the last two or three days.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, regardless of the fact that thousands of my people are on the brink of starvation I

shall respectfully yield to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut, the majority leader, and I shall not proceed with any filibuster, if he wants to compliment me by saying that.

Mr. TILSON. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to transfer to the control of the Secretary of Agriculture Sullys Hill National Park, together with all improvements thereon, in the State of North Dakota, and the Secretary of Agriculture shall hereafter administer said park as a big-game preserve, refuge, and breeding grounds for wild animals and birds, which shall be known as the Sullys Hill National Game Preserve, and shall embrace within its boundaries the lands described in the proclamation of June 2, 1904, establishing Sullys Hill Park, together with all unsurveyed or public lands uncovered by the recession of the waters of Devils Lake in front of said reservation, the preserve to be bounded on the north and northwest by the waters of Devils Lake and on the west and southwest by a stream which flows through lands uncovered by the recession of the waters of Devils Lake, approximately midway between lots 10 and 11, section 17; lots 1, 2, 6, and 8, section 16; and lot 2, section 9; lots 3, 4, and 5, section 16; township 152 north, range 65 west, fifth principal meridian, as meandered on the official plats of survey approved June 23, 1904, and June 2, 1927: *Provided*, That the said game preserve is to be made available to the public for recreational purposes in so far as consistent with the use of this area as a game preserve.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire, by purchase or otherwise, an area of land not to exceed 3,000 acres, with the improvements thereon, situated on the east and south of said preserve as described in section 1 of this act, within sections 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 22, 23, and 24, township 152 north, range 65 west, fifth principal meridian, said lands, upon acquisition by the United States, to become a part of the Sullys Hill National Game Preserve.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to construct and maintain such boundary and division fences as are required to inclose and subdivide the preserve, to construct such buildings and improvements, to install and maintain a suitable water-supply and sanitary system, to purchase such supplies, and to employ such assistants as are necessary for the maintenance of the preserve and the improvements thereon, and for the accommodation of visitors thereto.

Sec. 4. There is authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated such sums as Congress shall from time to time deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out the word "park" and insert the word "area."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the committee amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, was the bill being read the first time or was it read for amendment?

The SPEAKER. The bill was read for amendment under the consent granted that it would be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, has the Clerk read section 2?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk has completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to suggest to section 2. On page 2 the committee has recommended that section 2 of the bill be stricken out and new text inserted. At the proper time I desire to move a substitute for the committee amendment that would modify the old language of section 2 instead of striking it out and inserting new language.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, beginning in line 19 and ending in line 2, on page 3, strike out all of section 2 and insert in lieu thereof:

"Sec. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire, by purchase or otherwise, an area of adjacent land not to exceed 80 acres, with the improvements thereon, said lands upon acquisition by the United States, to become a part of the Sullys Hill National Game Preserve."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, as a substitute for the committee amendment I move that section 2 of the bill be amended. In line 20, on page 2, after the word "otherwise," insert the words "after July 1, 1932"; and in line 21, after the word "acres," insert the words "at an average cost of not more than \$10 an acre."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON as a substitute for the committee amendment: In line 20, page 2, after the word "otherwise," insert "after July 1, 1932," and in line 21, after the word "acres," insert "at an average cost of not more than \$10 per acre."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I am very much in sympathy with the purpose of this bill, which is to transfer what is now known as Sullys Hill National Park to the United States Biological Survey, to be known as the Sullys Hill National Game Preserve. May I take a minute or two in reference to the general purpose of the bill to explain the situation?

Two or three years ago I visited this area, and as a result of the visit I had something to do with the initiation of this legislation. This area now known as the Sullys Hill National Park, bearing the same designation approximately as Yosemite, the Yellowstone, and the Grand Canyon, is an area of 780 acres, in a prairie country with a little wood on it which is not valuable for timber. They do make fence posts and sometimes railroad ties out of the trees on this area and in this vicinity.

It is adjacent to Devils Lake, a large and interesting body of water. While it is now known and listed as a national park it is operated by the Biological Survey to-day. The National Park Service has nothing to do with it. The entrance to this area there at present carries a sign with the name "Sullys Hill National Game Preserve."

Tourists who see it listed as a national park sometimes travel quite a distance to see the park and when they get there they are disappointed because it is not up to the standard of scenery that they anticipated because of the name "national park."

The gentleman in charge of the game preserve, a fine young fellow, interested in its welfare, then feels hurt because these people when they come there talk unpleasantly about his game preserve.

It is a game preserve that is being used to the limit, and it can support game. I have in my files a list of the number of game of various sorts upon it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is there any game upon it?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; there is.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand it is a prairie country.

Mr. CRAMTON. That general region, but this area is an exception. This is a rough country with little hills.

Mr. STAFFORD. There are no trees on it?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; there are—not large trees but large enough to furnish fence posts and railroad ties. It does very well as a game preserve; and it has some recreation possibilities, but they are up to the limit in the capacity for game.

So, after my visit, the suggestion was made that it be used as a game preserve and turned over to the Biological Survey with notice to the tourists of the country as to what it is.

Then, since it is to be maintained as a game preserve, it ought to be more adequate; and since the adjacent region is well adapted along Devil's Lake, I suggested that the area be increased by the purchase of 3,000 acres to make it more adequate for a game preserve.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 10 minutes more.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAMTON. Lands similar to that now in use are available and are now only being used to take off the timber for fence posts and railroad ties—and I am somewhat doubtful about the railroad ties.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the gentleman acquainted with the acquisition of this national park?

Mr. CRAMTON. It was about 1904 that it was created. Congress had a little spell of creating national parks without much knowledge of what it was doing. We got two or three about then that ought not to have been created.

Mr. STAFFORD. What ones are those?

Mr. CRAMTON. There is the Platt Park in Oklahoma, the Wind Cave Park in South Dakota, and this Sullys Hill Park. I have thought it would be some service to the national park system to take away these misnomers, and as to this one we have been successful in working out an arrangement to which the people of North Dakota, the Park Service, and the Biological Service are agreeable. As introduced, the bill provided for the purchase of 3,000 acres of land, which we thought would cost seven to eight to ten dollars an acre on an average. The Budget did not feel that they could go that far, and the bill as proposed by the committee proposes only the purchase of 80 acres, having to do with the water supply, which is supposed to cost \$7,500. I have tried to meet the Budget view and the present stringency of the situation by eliminating any purchase of lands until the next fiscal year, 1932, is completed, so that there would be no burden on the Treasury until the fiscal year 1933, or later. I think it is advisable under the present stringency to leave out any land purchase until the fiscal year 1933.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment so that I may make a statement to the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. PARKS. The gentleman is discussing a very important matter. I want to inform the majority leader that this armistice is just for the day.

Mr. TILSON. Every little helps.

Mr. PARKS. Very well.

Mr. CRAMTON. So, Mr. Speaker, the first purpose of my amendment is to postpone any financial expenditure for the purchase of lands until the fiscal year 1933 or later. Second, instead of buying 80 acres for \$7,500, I propose to buy this tract of land of 3,000 acres at a limit of cost of \$10 an acre.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. It occurs to me that postponing the date of the purchase of the 3,000 acres until after July 1, 1932, may prevent the Government from purchasing the land at the price fixed in the gentleman's amendment. Immediately the owners of the land will know that it is going to be purchased by the Government, and they may sell the land at once or not enter into an arrangement for the sale of it at this price. The lands must be of a very poor character, indeed, even considering North Dakota sagebrush lands, to be purchasable at \$10 an acre.

Mr. CRAMTON. While the land with which my friend from North Dakota [Mr. HALL] is familiar, is suitable for this purpose, yet for purposes of cultivation they are quite inferior to the lands generally in North Dakota.

Mr. STAFFORD. On what basis does the gentleman justify his belief that they can be purchased for \$10 an acre?

Mr. CRAMTON. From such information as I secured in respect to the value of the lands when I was there. I may say also that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] when this bill has been up, had suggested a limitation as to cost, and I have tried to meet his views, and in postponing the purchase I have tried to meet the views of the Budget.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. I know how interested the gentleman is in this measure. If I understand the amendment he offers, it would permit the purchase of the 3,000 acres of land as provided in the original bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. The amendment is to permit no purchase until the fiscal year 1933, and then to permit the purchase of 3,000 acres at not more than \$10 an acre. Where the bill now contemplates buying only 80 acres to cost \$7,500,

my amendment contemplates the purchase of 3,000 acres at not to exceed \$10 an acre. While we are doing this little job I think we ought to do it right and be done with it. The amount of money is not so large, and I am postponing the time of purchase in order to meet the desire of the Budget.

Mr. COLTON. The amendment suggested by the committee is in accordance with the wishes of the Budget?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. And it was only in the interest of passing the bill that it was adopted.

Mr. CRAMTON. I understand that.

Mr. COLTON. The gentleman has given much more study to this than I have, and if he is convinced that this is in the interest of getting the bill enacted into law, I see no reason to oppose the amendment.

Mr. CRAMTON. I assumed, possibly incorrectly, that the opposition of the Budget to the purchase of the 3,000 acres would be met when we postponed it until the fiscal year 1933, when we hope the present stringency will have passed away, and also by the limit of cost.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for recognition in opposition to the amendment. My purpose is not to strenuously oppose the amendment, but largely to acquire information from the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HALL] as to whether he believes, if we postpone the effective date of the purchase of this land until July 1, 1932, the land can be purchased for the limit of cost, \$10 an acre?

Mr. HALL of North Dakota. I think so.

Mr. STAFFORD. Preferably I would rather strike out the effective date and authorize the purchase at once, because the amount involved is only \$30,000, rather than to have the Government held up a year hence or more with a higher valuation.

Mr. HALL of North Dakota. That could not come about. You can buy any of the land out there for from \$4 to \$12 an acre, all around there.

Mr. STAFFORD. No matter how poor North Dakota lands are in certain spots, this is about the poorest that can be found?

Mr. HALL of North Dakota. For farming purposes this is well nigh worthless.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has it any value for grazing purposes?

Mr. HALL of North Dakota. Not much.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to me for a moment to ask the gentleman from North Dakota a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. What is the assessed valuation of the property, so that we may have it in the Record?

Mr. HALL of North Dakota. I do not know what the assessed value of that property might be.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. One dollar per acre?

Mr. HALL of North Dakota. I do not suppose it would be more than that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I doubt whether it would be assessed even at that.

Mr. HALL of North Dakota. The taxes on a quarter section of that land would probably run from \$12 to \$16 an acre.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, the committee is willing to accept the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Michigan in lieu of the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to section 1 for the purpose of offering the following amendment. In section 1 I would offer an amendment—

Provided further, That hunting shall not be permitted on said game preserve.

Mr. HALL of North Dakota. That is absolutely all right. It is not permitted in any event.

Mr. COLTON. There is no objection to that amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to section 1 for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] asks unanimous consent to return to section 1 for the purpose of offering an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LA GUARDIA: Page 2, line 18, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further, That hunting shall not be permitted on said game preserve.*"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. COLTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

NATIONAL-PARK APPROACHES

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 12404) to amend the act of April 9, 1924, so as to provide for national-park approaches, and ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah calls up the bill H. R. 12404, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I think this bill is of sufficient importance to have it considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and I object.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Accordingly the House automatically resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12404) to provide for national park approaches, with Mr. CHINBLOM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT].

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, this bill was reported by the Committee on the Public Lands on the 21st of last June. At that time there was a favorable report on the part of the Secretary of the Interior, but the Bureau of the Budget was not yet ready to give its approval. This morning, however, we have a statement from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement from the Director of the Budget favorable to this bill, with the provision that certain amendments be included.

Those amendments are to meet a situation which has largely developed since the first reporting of the bill. The entire purpose of the bill was originally to provide approaches to the national parks to connect up the highway systems within the parks with the Federal-aid systems outside the parks. Since the reporting of this measure in the first place Congress has passed a number of other bills which have increased the appropriations for the construction of Federal highways. They are increased for roads in the national forests. Congress has enacted the Colton-Oddie bill, which has provided increased amounts for the construction of highways across Indian reservations and public lands. It is now the belief of the department, and of myself, that many of the roads which would have come under the provisions of this bill are now otherwise provided for, making it unnecessary to authorize the appropriation of as much for the approach roads as was originally apparently required, and leaving only the necessity, in a general way, of providing for the construction of those highways

making approaches to the national parks that are not otherwise provided for in this added legislation which has thus been enacted and for which increased appropriations have been made.

But an added situation has arisen as a direct result of the enactment of these very increased appropriations for various highways, highways across public lands, and highways across Indian reservations. That added situation is that through those increases we are speeding up the highway program outside the national parks under the Federal-aid program to an extent outstripping the construction of highways possible within the national parks themselves, and we are thus now failing to provide for bringing up to the proper standard as quickly as they should be completed and reconstructed, the roads within the parks, roads needed for the safety and use of all the people of this country. For that reason the form of the bill is to be somewhat changed by proposed amendments. While it is still to be an amendment of the same existing law the provision now to be advanced is that the amount appropriated for the next two fiscal years shall be \$7,500,000 per year.

At the present time \$5,000,000 is appropriated for the construction of highways within the national parks. This present proposal is to make possible an increase of that amount to \$7,500,000, with the provision that not to exceed \$1,500,000 of that amount shall be available during each of the next two fiscal years for the construction of such approaches to the national parks as may be necessary, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior. This changes to a great extent the emphasis toward a bringing up of the park highway systems to the standard of construction which is now being undertaken under the Federal-aid system outside and across national forests, and across Indian reservations and public lands.

That is the entire case, Mr. Chairman. Some amendments to bring that situation about have been suggested to the bill by the Secretary of the Interior and approved by the Director of the Budget. Two of those amendments have already been adopted by the committee and are in the report. They are minor amendments. It is my purpose to offer the others, with the exception of one which, to a certain extent, defeats the purpose of the bill and which, I am informed, is not to be insisted upon from any source.

I yield now to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. I am sure the House will be interested in the extent to which the States have utilized their funds, made available in conjunction with the national highway development project, in improving the roads which are approaches to the national parks.

The only justification for this bill, which throws the entire burden on the National Government, would be that the States absolutely decline to do anything in connection with the improvement of approach roads, so as to make the parks accessible to the tourists who travel on the main highways.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman from Montana will yield to me, I have had considerable contact with the attitude of the Western States in connection with this very matter. For instance, the State of Utah, where the chairman of this committee lives, does not have large tax resources. I understand that 74 per cent of its area is non-taxable land belonging to the United States. But from the first contact I had with them several years ago, when they were urging the construction of roads within the park, I said, "If we will build these roads within the park, when will the State build the proper approach roads?" They said, "We will build our approach roads to meet your road." They have done that. I think I can safely say that those Western States—Arizona, Utah, Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho, as well as the more prosperous States of California, Oregon, and Washington—have been very ready to build approach roads to reach the national parks, and I think they have made efforts far beyond what you would think would be their financial ability, but the difficulty has come in cases where a road goes either through a national forest

or through unreserved public land that is not taxable, which belongs entirely to the United States.

Mr. STAFFORD. Take the instances cited in the report of the approach roads to the Yosemite. California is not a poor State. The national prohibition act is making it a very prosperous State under the leadership of Mrs. Mabel Walker Willebrandt.

Mr. CRAMTON. Of course, the gentleman recognizes that all of the States are being made prosperous by reason of that wise amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mrs. Willebrandt has cajoled the Department of Justice into believing that wine is not within section 26, as posters in my city glaringly announce, so that California is profiting to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars because of its subsidized wine industry, whereas the manufacture of beer containing only 2¾ per cent—which would be of value to the farmers and tend to revive industry—is banned. Therefore California is prosperous in these prohibition days, and directly because of the national prohibition act.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman allow me to state on that question—

Mr. STAFFORD. On the prohibition question?

Mr. LEAVITT. Oh, no; on the question of California.

Mr. STAFFORD. Permit me to finish my question. According to this report, the cost of the approach roads to the Yosemite will be \$4,000,000 and more.

Mr. LEAVITT. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. The summary contained in the report in reference to the national parks is as follows:

Yosemite, 107 miles, at a cost of \$4,050,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. LEAVITT. When that report was made last June it included the various roads upon which it was proposed to make expenditures under this authorization, and as the bill was reported from the committee it called for an authorization of \$3,000,000 a year for five years, making \$15,000,000 for the single purpose of approach roads. Since then, I repeat, we have increased the amount of money for highways across the forests, the public lands and Indian reservations, although such roads were included in this report at that time. Several roads then reported have since been taken care of, so that there is now no need of appropriating for them again or making a new authorization for them.

Now, as to California: California itself has been giving precedence to these highways, several of them that are park-approach roads, and has been going ahead to take care of the situation quite fully.

So I will propose an amendment, as I have stated, which will change the form of this bill, increasing the amount that can be expended on the highway systems within the parks, with a provision that for a period of two years not to exceed \$1,500,000 of that increased amount can be spent, in the discretion of the Secretary, on these approach roads. That will bring it down to a matter of \$3,000,000 over a period of two years for approach roads. That will be the limit, instead of \$15,000,000 for five years. That is done because so many roads have already been provided for, have already been built, or are being carried forward under these other increased appropriations.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman any information as to what the total expense will be, excluding the authorizations which have been made for projected roads through Indian reservations, national parks, and the public domain, because there are some amounts in this report which are of considerable consequence? For the Yellowstone National Park the amount is \$5,408,000, which, I believe, is in the gentleman's State.

Mr. LEAVITT. It is mostly in the State of Wyoming.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the appropriations for the approaches will be largely made for the gentleman's State.

Mr. LEAVITT. To a considerable extent; yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, here is the Rocky Mountain National Park, in Colorado. Colorado is certainly not suffering by reason of arid lands, and it is rather moist down there as far as prosperity is concerned. For that park there is an estimated appropriation of \$3,000,000.

Mr. LEAVITT. The gentleman from Michigan calls my attention to the fact that the limit set in this bill is \$3,000,000, over a period of two years, instead of five yearly authorizations of \$3,000,000 each.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am trying to secure the latest information as to what will be the total amount expended in this connection on roads outside of Indian reservations, public parks, and the public domain.

Mr. LEAVITT. The statement made to me by the Director of the Park Service and the Secretary of the Interior is to the effect that this \$3,000,000 can be expected to meet at least the urgent situation, and that the remainder of the roads can be expected to be taken care of adequately out of these other increases.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to answer that question possibly more positively than the gentleman from Montana (Mr. LEAVITT) would care to state. In my judgment, this \$3,000,000 over a period of two years ought to cover all the need. Any other roads not covered by this 2-year program of \$1,500,000 a year for two years ought to be taken care of out of other road appropriations, and it seems to me this special approach-road program should end at the end of two years.

Mr. STAFFORD. After the two years have expired, may I obtain the gentleman's estimate as to how much will be required to complete these approach roads?

Mr. CRAMTON. My judgment is that the needs that are contemplated by this legislation would be completed in the two years. May I remind the gentleman that we have other legislation with reference to public roads, the Federal aid, and then we have the forest highways, and we have recently embarked on a policy of Federal construction of roads across the public domain. Some of these items ought to take care of whatever remains after the two years.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then it is the idea of the gentleman that this appropriation under the amended form will complete all that should be completed by the National Government without recourse to the States?

Mr. CRAMTON. Not quite. I want to be sure I am understood. It will complete all that needs to be taken care of by this special legislation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. There will remain Federal construction across the public domain.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, yes; Federal construction across the public domain, but not for approach roads.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; not primarily.

Mr. STAFFORD. Now, I take it, because I believe the gentleman is an advocate of the National Government becoming the supervisory official over some of these approach roads, that it is not his thought that because the Government launches into the policy of providing for the entire cost of these approach roads that this is to be used as a precedent in any way for the Government to police them.

Mr. COLTON. No.

Mr. LEAVITT. No; I would not say that this should be used as a precedent to build any roads that the States could be reasonably expected to take care of.

Mr. STAFFORD. No; I mean with respect to the idea of policing such roads, because the National Government has provided all the money. It is not the intention to say that inasmuch as the National Government has built the roads the National Government should police them.

Mr. LEAVITT. It is not my intention to do anything of the kind.

Mr. STAFFORD. I know the gentleman is the author of one bill, to which I have strenuously objected, which has that objective.

Mr. LEAVITT. I shall be pleased to debate that bill on next Calendar Wednesday, if we can get it up; but that bill is not coming up to-day.

Mr. STAFFORD. I hope the gentleman will not be able to get it up.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. HARE. I had the impression that when we speak of approach roads we mean roads that would merely aid in entering these national parks, but I can not conceive of a road 159 miles long being an approach road.

Mr. LEAVITT. Where does the gentleman get the figure of 159 miles?

Mr. HARE. I see here in the summary of the report that the approach for Yellowstone Park is to be 159 miles.

Mr. LEAVITT. That is not one road.

Mr. HARE. That does not strike me as being an approach road. A road that long would run through the entire length or breadth of some of our States.

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes; but that is not one road. That is simply several roads brought in under the original proposal. I asked the Park Service then to give me a statement of all the roads that might be authorized under the original form of the bill, and they reported how many could probably be brought in. But, as I stated before, many of those that in the original form of the bill were expected to be brought in under its provisions have since been provided for by action of the States or through increased forest highway funds or will be provided for through the operation of the Colton-Oddie bill, which allows the construction of roads across Indian reservations and public lands.

Mr. HARE. Does not the gentleman think that in view of the fact that some of the proposed approaches have been taken care of by the emergency bill referred to this authorization is unnecessary?

Mr. LEAVITT. It is not the emergency bill only. It comes under several different bills. For instance, the increased authorization for forest highways from \$7,500,000 to \$12,500,000, which was enacted by this Congress; the enactment of the Colton-Oddie bill, which is a form of legislation authorizing over a period of years roads across Indian reservations and public lands. That also takes care of part of it. Further, of course, some of this work can be speeded up under the emergency act which provides added funds, under existing law. These are all laws that authorize such construction.

Mr. HARE. I think it would have been very much better if the gentleman had set out in the report the length of these approaches to the national parks.

Mr. LEAVITT. The bill limits the length of any one road to 60 miles.

Mr. HARE. To my mind, that is a long road to be called an approach.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT] has again expired.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will permit, if it is exclusively through the public domain, which is nontaxable, it greatly changes the situation.

Mr. HARE. In reply to that statement, I would like to say that if these approaches or these roads that were contemplated this last year have been taken care of by other appropriations, does not the gentleman think it would be wise, in view of the present depressed economic condition and the numerous calls on the part of the public for moneys out of the Treasury, that these funds should not be added for these approaches at this time, but should go to places where there is greater necessity for public works?

Mr. LEAVITT. There is this situation. The only such long road that could come under this bill and which would require the maximum mileage is all in a national forest area where there is no possibility of constructing it except through these Federal funds. It could be built out of the forest highway funds some day perhaps, but there are more heavily timbered areas which require prior protection, and it would not come under the forest highway program for 15 or 20 years. It is only intended in this bill to allow enough money to increase the highway systems within the parks,

and to connect them up with the outside road systems. This bill is to allow such expenditure only in case no money is otherwise available within a reasonable time.

Mr. HARE. That is the point I was making. This increases the limit under the original bill.

Mr. LEAVITT. No; to the contrary, the original bill provided for five annual authorizations of \$3,000,000 each. This authorizes only two of one and one-half million dollars each.

Mr. HARE. Do I understand that instead of providing for \$15,000,000 appropriation the amendment would limit the appropriation to seven and a half million dollars?

Mr. LEAVITT. It goes further than that as far as the approach roads are concerned. It limits them to \$3,000,000. The unamended bill as the gentleman has it might be misleading.

Mr. HARE. It is misleading.

Mr. LEAVITT. At the present time we are appropriating \$5,000,000 a year for roads in the national parks. This bill proposes during its period of authorization that that amount shall be increased to seven and a half million dollars, making the increase for two years two and a half million dollars each year, thus making the total a \$5,000,000 increase. We then provide that the Secretary may, in case of necessity, use \$3,000,000 at \$1,500,000 a year on approach roads, if they are not otherwise provided for within a reasonable time.

Mr. CRAMTON. Let me emphasize that by reminding the gentleman that as to roads in national parks there is no limitation whatever. As to approach roads outside the parks, which was the principal purpose of the bill over five years, we make that not more than a million and a half a year for two years. I would like to emphasize the fact that the Secretary of the Interior is not definitely committed or obliged to spend even a million and a half dollars, but it gives him the authority to meet an emergency that might be brought to his attention and appeal to his judgment.

Mr. HARE. The gentleman understands that the sum total of the appropriation contemplated in this bill will be reduced from \$15,000,000 to what sum?

Mr. CRAMTON. Three million dollars as to approach roads. As to roads within the national parks, there is now no limit to the authorization.

Mr. HARE. I must object to the provision making approach roads from 60 to 100 miles long.

Mr. LEAVITT. When a national park is completely surrounded, as many are in the Western country, by timbered mountains, within the national forests, or by lands in public ownership, in order to meet that situation you must extend your road out as far as such territory itself extends in order to meet the purposes of the bill.

Mr. HARE. Then the approach road will be wholly on public land?

Mr. LEAVITT. That is practically true.

Mr. HARE. And not on private land?

Mr. LEAVITT. Oh, no. Speaking of this long road that I have in mind, that is true. And the bill requires that such roads must be largely on public lands. If there are a few intermingled patented lands, however, that fact should not be allowed to defeat the purpose of the bill, and the bill so provides. But there is little or no such private land in the territory traversed by this long road that the gentleman speaks of.

Mr. HARE. Is the land through which this approach passes patentable now?

Mr. LEAVITT. The long area I have in mind is in a national forest territory, and it would be subject to be patented only under the mining laws, or under what we call the act of June 11, 1906, which would require any tracts of land to be more valuable for agricultural than forest purposes.

In my judgment as an old forest ranger and supervisor, nothing of that kind is likely to happen in that territory. At the same time, there are some existing mining claims, and this does not disturb existing claims that are legitimate. Not in any way, of course.

Mr. HARE. Of course the gentleman will understand that I am not imputing any ulterior purpose, but there may be a

desire on the part of those who have the mining claims to have these approach roads constructed at present in order that they may use them for their own benefit.

Mr. LEAVITT. No; that is not the purpose behind this. It is true that there are in the vicinity of the boundary of one of the national parks some existing mining claims of long standing. There were mining claims there when Chief Joseph and his band went through in 1877. There is an area there that was then covered with mining claims. This road might open up that territory and make it easier to get to and from it; but those are existing claims at the present time, and that is just an incident to the situation.

Mr. YON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. YON. In the purpose of this bill and its application, what effect would this have on the building of roads over the public domain?

Mr. LEAVITT. Of course, if there is some necessary park approach over the public domain that is not otherwise provided for, this would allow the Secretary, within the limits of the appropriation, to construct such a road.

Mr. YON. Is provision made for that under the Colton-Oddie Act?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes; and in practically all cases the Colton-Oddie Act, or forest highway act, would take care of that.

Mr. YON. In the other instance, in the case of the national forests, where there is authorization to build roads and trails, the effect of this would be to supplement any amount authorized under those acts?

Mr. LEAVITT. It might be considered as a supplement. In some cases roads under this act might be built across the national forest areas, but if the road is within the program of the Forest Service, for forest purposes, such roads are now being constructed, or can be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. LEAVITT. This bill is only intended to take care of cases where the roads will not be constructed under these other laws.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I assume that it is the purpose of the framers of this legislation to have the State maintain the roads after they have been once constructed?

Mr. LEAVITT. That is the intention, and at the present time practically all of these roads are so maintained. The Secretary is authorized to enter into maintenance agreements with counties or States or municipal subdivisions, if it should become necessary. Surely we would not want the whole program held up because there are a few miles that the Secretary could not extend supervision over. There are some such roads that are now being and have been for years maintained short distances out, where it is a matter of necessity, through sparsely settled territory; but that is not the general situation at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. There may be no objection on the part of some toward a liberal policy to help the States to provide for the construction of these approach roads in the beginning, but if it is planned in any way to have those roads maintained for all time by the National Government then I think we ought to interpose some vigorous objection.

Mr. LEAVITT. That is not the purpose of the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is not the purpose of the bill, but why should not the States be willing and the sponsors of the bill be willing to accept an amendment that the maintenance after they are constructed shall be undertaken by the States?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. For illustration, I was talking with the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] about the condition around the Mesa Verde National Park.

The Government has withdrawn a strip 5 miles around the entire park over which the State of Colorado has absolutely no jurisdiction of any kind whatsoever. It is not a part of the park. It is withdrawn area. Would the gentleman think that over that 5-mile area the State of Colorado ought to maintain the rest of the road? It is not in a national park.

Mr. STAFFORD. No; but provision is made by law for the maintenance of roads across the national domain. If these roads are outside the national domain, where they are constructed for the benefit of your State, entirely by national appropriations, why should not your State agree to maintain them?

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. COLTON. These roads are not maintained for the benefit of the State in which the park is located.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the reason I am not contesting this, because they are used by everybody, but the money is spent there and it redounds to the benefit of the State. It is an improvement to the State.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am in accord with the gentleman's general attitude, and I think I am safe in saying that the department is generally in accord with that attitude. A few years ago, when specific authority was given for an approach road to the Grand Canyon from Williams in, I know an arrangement was made then with the State of Arizona so that after we get it completed to a certain standard they are to maintain it. I think in nearly every case the Secretary will succeed in doing that under the authority given him.

At the same time, there may come an unusual case where particular difficulties exist, where the Secretary would need authority to maintain a road which we constructed rather than to have it go to pieces. It seems to me we should be able to trust the Interior Department to go ahead with the one view they have had heretofore, that the maintenance will be assumed by the State, ordinarily, and I will remind the gentleman that it is optional and discretionary with the Secretary whether he will build any road, and having that club, he can require at least reasonable terms on the part of a State.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is well aware that every municipality or State is desirous of shifting the burdens of taxation to the National Government. I think it is bad policy for us to assume the obligation of that State function.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I do not want my statement to be taken as an indication that the State of Colorado refuses to maintain or does not maintain the road in question, but I want to direct attention to that particular type of situation. The State of Colorado does maintain that road.

Mr. STAFFORD. I hope none of the State authorities will make the inference that a State wishes to escape its customary responsibility for the maintenance of these roads.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL].

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I am only going to consume a few moments, but I want to call attention to just a few questions in this legislation.

In the first place, this bill is not from the proper committee. It is strictly a road bill and should have been considered by the Committee on Roads, which has jurisdiction over all legislation pertaining to the forests and public-land roads. I have said to the chairman of the committee that I do not intend to raise that question. It is too late to raise the question on this bill, but I want to emphasize the fact that if any other road bills are considered by any other committee and brought to the floor I will raise every question I am able to raise. The Road Committee should exercise the jurisdiction given to it by this House.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. COLTON. The Committee on the Public Lands originally handled the legislation dealing with roads in the parks, and I feel sure that is the reason this bill was referred to the Committee on the Public Lands. In a general way, I am in accord with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Roads.

Mr. DOWELL. Now, may I ask a question or two with reference to this bill? Are all the roads provided for in this bill within national parks?

Mr. LEAVITT. No. Of course, this provides for the extension, construction, or reconstruction of roads within national parks, as I expect to offer the amendments. I have stated that we are changing the form of the bill to make it more completely an amendment to the existing law providing for the construction of roads within the parks than it is in its original form. That law came from the Committee on the Public Lands, and this is an amendment of that law.

We feel that it should be made to conform fully to the purpose of the law, which came out of the Committee on Public Lands, having to do with roads within the parks. It only provides, in addition, that those within the park system of roads may be extended out to proper connections, where other provisions under existing laws will not bring it about in a reasonable time.

Mr. DOWELL. In that respect it seems to me you are building roads entirely outside the Federal-aid system, and you are holding the Government to paying for roads through territory clearly outside of the Government's function and outside of Government lands.

Mr. COLTON. If the gentleman will permit, it has nothing at all to do with the Federal-aid system of roads.

Mr. DOWELL. No; and that is the reason I am raising the question.

Mr. COLTON. The appropriation is limited to \$3,000,000, or will be when the proper amendment is offered.

Mr. DOWELL. But under this bill you may build a road outside of Federal-aid system, roads to be built by the Government outside of Government land and outside national parks.

Mr. COLTON. If it is an approach road and connects with a park road; yes.

Mr. DOWELL. May I read one paragraph?

Provided, That such approach roads so designated shall be limited to not to exceed 60 miles in length between a park gateway and the nearest convenient 7 per cent system road.

Now, that reads, if I read it correctly, that under this law you have a right to build 60 miles of road by the Federal Government on land that the Government does not own in order to connect it up with some other road?

Mr. LEAVITT. No. It would have to be a national forest or public-land area to a very great extent.

Mr. DOWELL. The language of this bill does not so state. The language of this bill opens this entirely and provides that the Government may build a road outside of the park, and it builds it entirely and there is no contribution as provided by the Federal aid law.

Mr. LEAVITT. The gentleman has only read the proviso. Section 4 states in the original form of the bill:

Whenever the Secretary of the Interior shall determine it to be in the public interest he may designate as national park approach roads and as supplementary parts of the highway systems of any of the national-park roads whose primary value is to carry national-park travel and which lead across lands wholly or partly owned by the Government of the United States and which will connect the highways within a national park with a convenient point on or leading to the Federal 7 per cent highway system.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], I understand, intends to offer an amendment, which I personally intend to accept and which I believe the committee will accept, in which that will be strengthened, and instead of saying "wholly or partly" will say "wholly or largely." That limitation is placed in the bill in good faith, with the idea that it is not intended to construct these roads on areas that should be taken care of by the States, by the counties, or by any other source.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, this is just why I raised the question a moment ago. You are amending the Federal aid act in a bill that comes from a committee that has not had charge of the legislation which has been brought to the House from time to time for the expenditure of the vast amount of money we are expending for the construction of Federal aid roads. I think this ought to be limited to land owned by the Government of the United States, and there should be no amendment of the Federal aid act in order to get some special legislation for some special road.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. I yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think we are not as far apart as we might seem to be.

Mr. DOWELL. If the gentleman will make his amendment broad enough to hold to that principle, I will be very pleased.

Mr. CRAMTON. As I understand, the intention of the bill is practically to limit these roads to federally owned land, but if you do as you have suggested you would limit the operation of the bill entirely to federally owned land, whereas there might be a homestead claim or a half dozen homestead claims along a valley which would hold up the building of a road 30 miles long just because of that little area. I sympathize with the gentleman. I did not think the word "partly" was strong enough, so I am proposing to insert the word "largely."

Mr. DOWELL. May I suggest to the gentleman that if he will use the word "entirely" instead of the word "largely," it will meet all objections?

Mr. CRAMTON. But that might defeat a 30-mile project, because there are a half dozen homesteads along its route.

Mr. LEAVITT. Would it not meet the gentleman's objection if we said 90 per cent, in order to take care of certain areas where some person may have taken up a mining claim back in the mountains and patented it?

Mr. DOWELL. I am not familiar with what the gentleman is trying to do, as I have not had an opportunity to go into it, but I want to stop the idea of going outside of the Federal-aid system and the Government building these special roads where there should be contributions made by the States.

Mr. COLTON. If the gentleman will yield, this is a practical problem. A few homestead entries might interfere with the building of a road through a certain area and defeat a necessary project. In working out the problems connected with the Colton-Oddie bill we have found that a few homesteads in an entire township may block a project. I hope it will not, but that is a possibility.

Mr. DOWELL. I know the gentleman from Michigan has been very watchful of this legislation, and I have great faith in his information on the subject; but I want to say to him that I believe he ought to make his amendment even stronger than he has suggested. If he can do so, I shall be very much pleased.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman from Montana has made a suggestion which would seem to me to meet the situation and also the views of the gentleman from Iowa. Instead of using the word "partly" use the words "to the extent of 90 per cent," so it will reach lands wholly or to the extent of 90 per cent owned by the Government of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in the national parks and monuments under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior" (43 Stat. 90; U. S. C., title 16, p. 390, sec. 8), approved April 9, 1924, is hereby amended by adding the following:

"Sec. 4. Whenever the Secretary of the Interior shall determine it to be in the public interest he may designate as national park approach roads and as supplementary parts of the highway systems of any of the national-park roads whose primary value is to

carry national-park travel and which lead across lands wholly or partly owned by the Government of the United States and which will connect the highways within a national park with a convenient point on the Federal 7 per cent highway system: *Provided*, That such approach roads so designated shall be limited to not to exceed 60 miles in length between a park gateway and the nearest convenient 7 per cent system road; or, if such approach road is now on the 7 per cent system, it shall be limited to not to exceed 30 miles: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 40 miles of such approach road shall be designated in any one county.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 7, after the word "on," insert the words "or leading to."

Page 2, line 13, strike out the word "such" and insert the words "any one."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendments which I have sent to the Clerk's desk. The first amendment is the one suggested, in effect, by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 2, line 4, strike out the word "partly" and insert the words "to the extent of 90 per cent."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment, which I have sent to the Clerk's desk, which is merely a clarifying amendment made necessary by the committee amendment in line 7.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 2, line 10, after the word "and," insert the words "such point on or leading to."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. Page 2, line 11, strike out the word "now." As the bill reads, it provides "the road is now on the 7 per cent system." The test ought to be whether it is on the 7 per cent system at the time the question comes before the Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 2, line 11, strike out the word "now."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to construct, reconstruct, and improve such national-park approach roads so designated, inclusive of necessary bridges, and to enter into agreements for the maintenance thereof with State or county authorities, or to maintain them when otherwise necessary; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following sums, to be expended for the purposes of this act: The sum of \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932; the sum of \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933; the sum of \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934; the sum of \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935; the sum of \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936: *Provided*, That under agreement with the Secretary of the Interior the Secretary of Agriculture may carry out any or all of the provisions of this section.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, I offer certain committee amendments, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEAVITT: Page 2, line 20, after the word "and," add the following: "for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of such national-park approach roads, as well as of roads and trails within the national parks and national monuments."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I desire to offer a substitute for the committee amendment. It is not intended to change the effect of the

committee amendment, but I think it makes the language much clearer, and I shall offer the amendment at line 20, page 2, as a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. With a point of order reserved, there can not be an amendment offered.

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, I will offer it for the information of the committee, and then I will make my explanation, and I hope the gentleman will withdraw his point of order. As a matter of fact, I do not think it is subject to a point of order.

I offer an amendment as a substitute for the committee amendment, page 2, line 20, after the word "necessary," insert the language which I have sent to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report for information the substitute proposed to be offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] for the amendment already offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT], to which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] has reserved a point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

As a substitute for the committee amendment Mr. CRAMTON offers the following: Page 2, line 20, after the word "necessary," strike out the semicolon and the word "and" and insert in lieu thereof the following: ", as well as to construct, reconstruct, improve, and maintain roads and trails within the national parks and national monuments, and for all such purposes."

Mr. CRAMTON. If I may explain this amendment and incidentally the other amendment, the purpose of both the committee amendment and mine, as I understand it, is to conform to the new scope of the bill which, as originally introduced, had to do only with approach roads and was never approved by the Budget in that form, but as now approved by the Budget the amendment presented contemplates roads within parks as well as roads outside.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, here we have presented a bill that relates exclusively to approach roads and now the gentleman is seeking to extend it to roads within national parks and national monuments.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Certainly.

Mr. LEAVITT. This bill is an amendment of a certain act, and that act authorizes the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in the national parks and monuments under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. The title does not make the law. This is an amendment of an act that is for the purpose of construction, and so forth, of roads within the parks, so, in my judgment, the amendment would not be subject to a point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. The subject matter before the House is one thing and only one thing, and that is approach roads and not the original act providing for the construction of roads within the national parks. However, I do not desire to argue the point of order now.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; and I was just going to suggest that I am sure the gentleman is in accord with the bill as it has been explained, and if he is, such language as is proposed is highly desirable, and as it will read with the amendment I have suggested, this would be the situation:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to construct, reconstruct, and improve such national-park approach roads so designated, inclusive of necessary bridges, and to enter into agreements for the maintenance thereof with State or county authorities, or to maintain them when otherwise necessary.

All this has to do with approach roads, and then because of the change in the appropriation you need to put in this:

As well as to construct, reconstruct, improve, and maintain roads and trails within the national parks and national monuments; and for all such purposes there is hereby authorized to be appropriated—

And so forth.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the necessity for the proposed substitute?

Mr. CRAMTON. Because as the Budget have now approved the bill, the amendments that are suggested have to do with roads within parks as well as outside.

Mr. STAFFORD. Wherein do those amendments relate to roads within the parks?

Mr. CRAMTON. My substitute, in effect, is not different from the committee amendment, but is much smoother and perhaps more orderly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Wherein does this bill provide for roads within national parks and national monuments?

Mr. CRAMTON. The original act, to which this is an amendment, was an act that came from the Public Lands Committee that had to do solely with roads in national parks and now they are amending it to take in roads outside.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the necessity for the substitute amendment and wherein is the present, original act deficient, so that this substitute is required?

Mr. COLTON. This is a clarifying amendment which makes it consistent with the intent of the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I may be obtuse, but this seems a different program entirely.

Mr. CRAMTON. So far as the present law is concerned, the law creating national parks gives them the responsibility of developing national parks and making them accessible, and carries full authority to build whatever roads are necessary. In the amendment to section 5, as proposed in the bill reported, it provides for the construction of certain approach roads to national parks.

Now the Budget desires to tie that appropriation for approach roads into the general appropriation for roads in the parks, the fact being that the Budget never did approve of the large expenditure outside of the parks for approach roads, but was agreeable to tying into the park appropriation something on a 2-year program for the approach roads. Instead of having \$15,000,000 available for approach roads as the bill was introduced here, they are now proposing to increase the park road appropriation \$2,500,000 a year for two years, out of which \$1,500,000 a year may be used for approach roads.

Mr. HARE. Your amendment is for the purpose of giving authority to the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of the Interior for an appropriation for approaches to the national parks?

Mr. CRAMTON. It is to make it clear that the appropriation authorized for roads within the parks may be to the extent of a million and a half dollars a year for two years used for approach roads.

Mr. HARE. Under the existing law the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of the Interior could not include appropriations for the construction and maintenance of approach roads to the park.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HARE. And this bill is for the purpose of constructing these approach roads? And this amendment, I gather, is for the purpose of tying the approach roads into the original bill, so that hereafter the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget can have annual appropriations for the construction and maintenance of approach roads year after year?

Mr. CRAMTON. No; the bill does not give any indefinite authority for year after year. The amendment provides for approach roads. If the bill goes through, as the gentleman from Montana and the committee now propose, it will give the Bureau of the Budget the authority to tie into the general item for the park roads something, not more than a million and a half dollars a year, for not more than two years, for approach roads.

They have an unlimited authority now for appropriations for roads within the parks but do not have authority for appropriations for roads outside of the parks. What the committee is trying to do is instead of authorizing \$3,000,000 a year for five years for approach roads to tie this comparatively small amount into the general park roads appropriation.

Mr. HARE. Then I do not see the necessity for the amendment.

Mr. COLTON. There is some question whether it is tied into the general appropriation without this amendment.

Mr. HARE. If it is tied in would not that in itself give the Department of the Interior the right to recommend another appropriation for building approach roads?

Mr. COLTON. The bill itself provides the program for approach roads for two years.

Mr. HARE. It provides an authorization for appropriations for two years and it also gives to the department authority at any time in the future to recommend appropriations.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is a query in my mind whether or not it would not authorize the use of the appropriation for roads in national parks and monuments for the purpose of constructing approach roads?

Mr. CRAMTON. I see the gentleman's point. The amendment now before us is only a clarifying amendment. The effect of the bill will be just the same but the language will be clearer.

If the bill goes through as it is now proposed it is true that it says that the Secretary is authorized to construct.

But then it goes on to say:

And for all such purposes there is hereby authorized to be appropriated—

For certain fiscal years certain amounts.

There is a limit of cost, and no more money for any other year can be appropriated under this bill for such approach roads.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; but your authorizing language is not restrained by that.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think it is, clearly, and because I fear it is I propose another amendment at the end of the section to provide that nothing in the act shall be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary to hereafter construct, and so forth, roads in the parks.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not objecting to the gentleman's last amendment, but I am not willing to have an amendment injected into the bill that will be a continuing authority to the Park Service or the Department of the Interior to construct approach roads.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. Is the gentleman's question directed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan or to the committee amendment?

Mr. STAFFORD. They are of the same character, and I can not see the necessity for either. I can see the advisability of the last suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan, but I can not see the need of having either the committee amendment or the gentleman's substitute.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that my substitute amendment does not change the matter at all except to make it clear, but I see what the gentlemen are getting at, and I shall suggest another amendment that I believe will satisfy their fears. On page 2, line 16, after the word "authorized," insert "in the fiscal years 1932 and 1933". If that be adopted, the only authority to build approach roads will be in those two fiscal years, and then, after you get through talking about approach roads, in the amendment that I have at the desk, and are talking about roads in the parks, simply say "as well as hereafter to construct roads in the parks." That will make it definitely clear that only in those two fiscal years can they build approach roads, but in all the years hereafter they can build the roads in the parks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, with the suggested amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition, and will first offer this amendment. The amendment which I have sent to the desk has not yet been reported, so that I do not have to withdraw it, but as a substitute for the committee amendment I offer to amend on page 2, line 16, by inserting after the word "authorized" the words "during the fiscal years 1932 and 1933," and also, on page 2, line 20, after the word "necessary" strike out the semicolon and the word "and" and insert the following:

As well as hereafter construct, reconstruct, improve, and maintain roads and trails within national parks and national monuments, and for all such purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 2, line 16, after the word "authorized," insert the words "during the fiscal years 1932 and 1933," and on page 2, line 20, after the word "necessary," strike out the semicolon and the word "and" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "as well as hereafter to construct, reconstruct, improve, and maintain roads and trails within national parks and national monuments, and for all such purposes."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggests that there are two amendments there.

Mr. CRAMTON. I ask unanimous consent that they be considered together as a substitute for the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan by way of substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT].

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, we are all trying to get at the same point, and the committee is willing to accept the substitute.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now comes upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana, as amended by the substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 22, after the word "sums," strike out the comma and insert a colon, and on the same page in the same line strike out the word "to."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggests that the Clerk read the lines 22 and 23 as they will read with the amendment.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I sent to the Clerk's desk was that presented to me through the Budget. I ask unanimous consent that the various sentences there that have to do with the amounts be included as one amendment down to and including the striking out of that part of line 4 on page 3 ending with the figures "1936." That is really all one amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment as now offered in lieu of the amendment heretofore offered by the gentleman from Montana.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 22, after the word "sums," strike out the comma and insert a semicolon; the same page, same line, strike out the word "to"; page 2, line 23, strike out the entire line; page 2, line 24, strike out the entire line with the exception of the word "the"; page 2, line 25, strike out the amount "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$7,500,000"; page 3, line 1, change the year from "1933" to "1932"; the same line, the same page, eliminate "\$3,000,000" and insert the sum of "\$7,500,000"; page 3, line 2, change the year "1934" to "1933"; the same page, the same line, eliminate the following: "The sum of \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year"; page 3, line 3, eliminate the entire line; page 3, line 4, eliminate the words "year ending June 30, 1936."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted, I will read it as it will read with the committee amendments. Beginning on page 2, line 20, it will read:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the following sums: The sum of \$7,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932; the sum of \$7,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933—

Provided, and so forth.

Mr. LEAVITT. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment in the form suggested by the gentleman from Michigan.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 22, strike out the comma after the word "sums" and the words "to be expended for the purposes of this act," so the paragraph will then read "The sum of \$7,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932; the sum of \$7,500,000 for the fiscal

year ending June 30, 1933." Strike out the remainder of the section down to the word "provided" in line 4.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to inquire whether that is in the correct form?

Mr. LEAVITT. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. The pending amendment places the amount of appropriation at \$7,500,000 for the next ensuing two fiscal years. Nevertheless, in fact, there is an increase in each of those two years of \$2,500,000 by reason of prior authorizations of \$5,000,000 for the building of roads in the national parks.

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, there is no limit to the authorization, but we have a definite program of \$5,000,000 a year for roads, and, in the Department of the Interior appropriation bill that was recently passed, \$5,000,000 was carried for the fiscal year 1932, and we would expect the same thing for 1933, but this bill raises it \$2,500,000 for 1932 and 1933.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana as last reported.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 2, line 19, strike out the word "with" and insert the word "by."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment on page 3, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 3, line 7, following the Leavitt amendment, insert the following: "Nothing in this act shall be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to hereafter construct, reconstruct, improve, and maintain roads and trails within the national parks and national monuments."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that that amendment remain pending until a further committee amendment is offered.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, this amendment will remain pending until a further committee amendment has been presented.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment following the word "section," striking out the comma and inserting a semicolon and the words "Provided further, That not to exceed \$1,500,000 shall be allocated annually for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of such national park approach roads."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LEAVITT: Page 3, line 7, change the period to a semicolon and insert the following: "Provided further, That not to exceed \$1,500,000 shall be allocated annually for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of such national park approach roads."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment which was laid over pending action upon the last amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 7, following the amendment just adopted, insert the following:

"Nothing in this act shall be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to hereafter construct, reconstruct, improve, and maintain roads and trails within the national parks and national monuments."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask to amend the amendment by inserting at the beginning of the amendment the words "Provided further, That."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the amendment to the amendment, as follows:

At the beginning of the amendment insert the words "Provided further, That."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 6. Whenever any such approach road is proposed under the terms of this act across or within any national forest the Secretary of the Interior shall secure the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture before construction shall begin.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CHINDBLOM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12404) to amend the act of April 9, 1924, so as to provide for national-park approaches, had instructed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any of the amendments? [After a pause.] If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. COLTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, the legislation which the House passed just now is legislation that will solve several very perplexing situations. I think the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT] is entitled to the thanks of all those western communities that will benefit by this legislation. I have known some of the persistence with which he has followed an effort for something of this kind for several years, and without being willing to yield to defeat after defeat he has persisted and finally sees legislation go through that will adequately take care of the situation. [Applause.]

In my judgment, neither the bill as reported by the House committee or the Senate bill, identical in terms, could have passed this House. Realizing this, the gentleman from Montana has labored with the department and with the Budget, and has secured a new draft which has their approval and has now passed this House. I insert the Budget report approving the Leavitt compromise and a copy Mr. Albright has given me of his letter to Mr. LEAVITT supporting this Leavitt bill.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, January 13, 1931.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have your letter of January 13, 1931, in further reference to S. 3073, authorizing appropriations for national park approach roads. You express your desire to make a favorable report on the bill if it be modified as indicated in the memorandum of proposed amendments which accompanied your letter.

You are advised that, if modified in accordance with your proposed amendments, which provide, among other things, that the total authorization of appropriation for approach roads as well as for roads within the parks for each of the fiscal years 1932 and 1933 shall be \$7,500,000, the expenditures contemplated by the bill would not be in conflict with the financial program of the President.

Very truly yours,

J. CLAWSON ROOP, *Director.*

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, January 14, 1931.

Hon. SCOTT LEAVITT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. LEAVITT: In response to your personal request relative to appropriations for construction of roads and trails in national parks as compared with appropriations for roads and trails in national forests and for Federal aid, I have to advise that the first appropriations for Federal aid and for national-forest highways was in 1916, and it was not until 1924 that the first appropriation was made for roads and trails in national parks when \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

It was not until 1928 that the annual appropriation for roads and trails in national parks was increased to \$5,000,000. During these years appropriations for forest roads were at the rate of \$7,500,000 annually, while last year Congress authorized for the fiscal years 1932 and 1933 appropriations of \$12,500,000 per year for construction of roads in national forests.

Appropriations for Federal aid have been granted annually at the rate of \$75,000,000, but last year Congress increased Federal-aid funds to \$125,000,000 for the fiscal years 1932 and 1933. No increase has been granted in funds for the national parks. Construction of new roads and reconstruction of old roads in national parks is seriously lagging behind road improvements and extensions in the States within which the parks lie. For instance, it has been estimated that it will take at least eight years to complete the work of placing the Yellowstone Park road system on modern standards if additional funds are not made available, and in Yosemite it will not be possible to rebuild the present road system in less than seven to nine years at the rate money is now being allotted.

It therefore appears urgent that the present need of the National Park Service is for more money for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails within national parks and national monuments, and authority to meet extraordinary approach road problems outside of the national parks by granting the Secretary of the Interior authority to act in his discretion in meeting such unusual situations by allocating funds from the regular appropriations each year to meet such approach road emergencies.

You have asked whether there are any precedents for the construction of roads outside of the national parks. A great many years ago Congress authorized in the regular appropriation bill—the old sundry civil bills—the construction of the east and south approaches to Yellowstone National Park from Cody, Wyo., and from the Jackson Hole region, respectively. These roads are still maintained by the National Park Service under special authority contained in the appropriation bills.

The act of June 5, 1924, authorized the National Park Service to construct a highway from Williams on the National Old Trails Highway to the south boundary of the Grand Canyon National Park. The grading on this project has been completed and the surfacing will be done within the next two years. The total cost of this project will exceed \$500,000.

Again, under special authority contained in the appropriation acts, the National Park Service built the original road system on the east side of Glacier Park. Practically all of this highway, as you know, is on the Blackfoot Indian Reservation. This Glacier Park road system is still maintained by the National Park Service, and improvements on the road are being accomplished by this bureau. For instance, it is contemplated that within a year or two this road will be given a surfacing of oil macadam.

We are also authorized to construct and reconstruct certain stretches of the roads outside the boundary of Yosemite National Park.

All of these approach problems have been handled in the regular appropriation bills, and, of course, it would be highly desirable to have general authority to meet emergencies growing out of approach road problems in order that there might be no question about the submission of the estimates to the Bureau of the Budget and in order to insure appropriation items against points of order.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has advised that the pending approach road bill, if modified so that the total authorization of appropriation for approach roads, as well as for roads within the parks, be limited to \$7,500,000 for the fiscal years 1932 and 1933, the bill would not be in conflict with the financial program of the President. A copy of supplemental report by the Secretary to the chairman of the House Public Lands Committee is inclosed for your information.

Sincerely yours,

HORACE M. ALBRIGHT, *Director.*

P. S.—Not counting the new eastern parks, the national park road program calls for the construction and reconstruction of 1,597 miles of roads. Of these 356 miles have been constructed or re-

constructed and 350 miles of trails have been built. The trail program has not been completed and the total mileage is not now known. However, up to the present time 420 miles of trails have been constructed or are under construction.

SURVEY OF PUBLIC LANDS LYING WITHIN THE LIMITS OF LAND GRANTS AND FORFEITURE TO THE UNITED STATES OF UNSURVEYED LAND GRANTS TO RAILROADS

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 7254) to amend an act entitled "An act making an appropriation for the survey of public lands lying within the limits of land grants, to provide for the forfeiture to the United States of unsurveyed land grants to railroads, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910, and I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah calls up House bill 7254, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I think we should consider this bill in the committee. I object.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar, and the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7254) to amend an act entitled "An act making an appropriation for the survey of public lands lying within the limits of land grants, to provide for the forfeiture to the United States of unsurveyed land grants to railroads, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910, with Mr. CHINDELOM in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7254, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA].

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to call the attention of the committee to section 2 of this bill. It provides:

That when the Commissioner of the General Land Office shall ascertain the amount of any money or moneys deposited for the survey of lands for which repayment is authorized by this statute, the Secretary of the Interior shall at once certify such amounts to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to make repayment of all amounts so certified out of any moneys not otherwise appropriated, and issue his warrant in settlement thereof.

There has been a tendency to get away from our financial policy and budgetary system, and attempts are repeatedly made to authorize direct payments without the authorization of Congress or appropriations by Congress for such payments. We had an instance of that the other day in a small bill on the Consent Calendar from the Committee on Immigration, authorizing the payment of a clerk out of fees received—a direct payment. It has been the custom—and I concede that at times it is cumbersome—that all moneys are covered into the Treasury and only paid out through direct appropriations by Congress. In the long run that has been found the best system. I do not believe it was the intention of the committee to deviate from the adopted system, a system which we have followed for so many years. I will leave it to the better judgment of the gentlemen who are familiar with conditions as to the merits of the bill, and I will go along with them, but I simply suggest a change in section 2, providing that the Secretary of the Interior shall, upon being informed of the amount of repayments, include such amounts in the department's estimates to Congress for appropriations for the next fiscal year. That will follow

our system of making payments; there will be no direct payments made and each payment will be included each year in the bills providing appropriations for the Department of the Interior. That is the suggestion I make simply in keeping with our financial policy.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT].

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, I think, is entirely satisfactory. The language as at present in section 2 was put in because it complies with the wording of the old law and the provisions provided in the old law, but the amendment suggested by the gentleman from New York will be accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act making an appropriation for the survey of public lands lying within the limits of land grants, to provide for the forfeiture to the United States of unsurveyed land grants to railroads, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to add thereto, at the end of said section 1, a proviso, as follows: "And provided further, That in the event any railroad corporation or corporations shall deposit, under the provisions of this act, any money or moneys for the survey of any lands within the limits of its or their said grant or grants, which upon investigation by the Secretary of the Interior, or otherwise, are thereafter found to be excepted from the operation of such grant or grants, there shall be repaid to such railroad corporation or corporations the cost of surveying the lands so excepted from the operation of its or their said grant or grants upon application therefor: And provided further, That such railroad corporation or corporations, or its or their legal representatives, shall file a request for the repayment of such money or moneys within two years from and after the date of the determination of the company's rights or within two years from the date of the passage of this act as to such determinations as have heretofore been made."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 12, after the word "grants," insert the words "except in those cases in which the cost of surveying the base land shall have been applied to the payment of surveying fees on lands selected in lieu thereof."

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, there should be a comma after the word "grants" in line 12 and one after the word "thereof" in line 14.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the committee amendment will be amended by inserting the two commas.

There was no objection.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That when the Commissioner of the General Land Office shall ascertain the amount of any money or moneys deposited for the survey of lands for which repayment is authorized by this statute, the Secretary of the Interior shall at once certify such amounts to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to make repayment of all amounts so certified out of any moneys not otherwise appropriated, and issue his warrant in settlement thereof.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LA GUARDIA: On page 3, line 1, after the word "shall," strike out the remainder of the section and add in lieu thereof the following: "include such amounts in the department's estimates to Congress for appropriations for the next fiscal year."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. HOOPER having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. CHINDBLOM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7254) to amend an act entitled "An act making an appropriation for the survey of public lands lying within the limits of land grants, to provide for the forfeiture to the United States of unsurveyed

land grants to railroads, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. COLTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE STATE OF UTAH

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 12697) to authorize an exchange of lands between the United States and the State of Utah, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOOPER). The gentleman from Utah calls up the bill (H. R. 12697) and asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H. R. 12697

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to accept on behalf of the United States title to the lands hereinafter described, containing 23,840 acres, more or less, owned by the State of Utah, and in exchange therefor may patent to the said State not more than an equal area of surveyed, unreserved, nonmineral, and unappropriated public lands in said State. The lands to be accepted by the United States are described as follows:

The southeast quarter, south half southwest quarter, northeast quarter southwest quarter section 9; southeast quarter northwest quarter, northeast quarter, south half section 10; west half, west half northeast quarter section 11; northwest quarter, north half southwest quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter, southeast quarter section 14; north half, southwest quarter section 15; south half northeast quarter, south half section 17; southeast quarter southeast quarter section 18; southeast quarter southwest quarter, southwest quarter southeast quarter, east half southeast quarter, east half northeast quarter section 19; all of section 20; all of section 21; southwest quarter southwest quarter, northwest quarter northwest quarter section 22; west half, west half east half, northeast quarter northeast quarter section 23; northwest quarter section 26; northeast quarter northeast quarter, west half northwest quarter, northwest quarter southwest quarter section 27; south half, northwest quarter, west half northeast quarter, northeast quarter northeast quarter section 28; south half, northeast quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter section 29; west half, northeast quarter, west half southeast quarter section 30; north half, southeast quarter, east half southwest quarter, southwest quarter southwest quarter section 31; northwest quarter, west half northeast quarter, northeast quarter northeast quarter, north half southwest quarter, southwest quarter southwest quarter section 33; north half southwest quarter section 34, all in township 16 south, range 5 west, Salt Lake base and meridian.

The east half section 1; south half section 13; southeast quarter, southeast quarter northeast quarter section 14; northeast quarter, east half northwest quarter, northwest quarter northwest quarter, south half southeast quarter section 24; northeast quarter, north half northwest quarter, southwest quarter northwest quarter, west half southwest quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter, southwest quarter southeast quarter section 25; north half, north half south half, southwest quarter southwest quarter section 36, all in township 17 south, range 6 west, Salt Lake base and meridian.

The southeast quarter section 3; southwest quarter, west half northwest quarter section 4; all of section 5; southeast quarter, north half section 6; northeast quarter, north half southeast quarter section 7; all of section 8; northeast quarter northwest quarter section 9; northeast quarter, east half southwest quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter section 10; northeast quarter northwest quarter, southwest quarter northwest quarter, northwest quarter southwest quarter section 15; northwest quarter southwest quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter section 16; all of section 17; southeast quarter section 18; east half section 19; all of section 20; west half, northeast quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter section 21; north half northwest quarter, southwest quarter northwest quarter, northwest quarter southwest quarter section 28; east half, southwest quarter section 30; east half, southwest quarter, east half northwest quarter, northwest

quarter northwest quarter section 31, all in township 17 south, range 5 west, Salt Lake base and meridian.

The west half southwest quarter section 4; south half, northwest quarter northwest quarter section 5; north half, southeast quarter, east half southwest quarter, southwest quarter southwest quarter section 6; all of section 7; all of section 8; southwest quarter, west half northwest quarter section 9; all of section 17; all of section 18; northwest quarter, north half northeast quarter, south half southeast quarter section 19; all of section 20; southwest quarter section 21; west half, west half east half section 29; east half, east half southwest quarter section 30; northeast quarter, east half northwest quarter, north half southeast quarter, west half southwest quarter section 31, all in township 18 south, range 5 west, Salt Lake base and meridian.

The northeast quarter southwest quarter, south half southwest quarter, southwest quarter southeast quarter section 3; northeast quarter, east half northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, southwest quarter southeast quarter section 9; north half northwest quarter section 10, all in township 19 south, range 5 west, Salt Lake base and meridian.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. COLTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

COMPACTS OR AGREEMENTS BETWEEN WYOMING AND IDAHO

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 2865) granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of Wyoming and Idaho with respect to the boundary line between said States. This bill is on the House Calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah calls up the bill S. 2865, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 2865

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Wyoming and Idaho to negotiate and enter into compacts or agreements with respect to the boundary line between said States.

SEC. 2. Such consent is given upon condition that a representative of the United States from the Department of the Interior, to be appointed by the President, shall participate in the negotiations and shall make report to Congress of the proceedings and of any compact or agreement entered into. Other than the compensation and expenses for such representative the United States shall not be liable for any expenses in connection with such negotiations, compact, or agreement.

SEC. 3. No such compact or agreement shall be binding or obligatory upon either of such States unless and until it has been approved by the legislature of each of such States and by the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is herewith expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. COLTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MOUNT RAINIER NATIONAL PARK

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 15008) to extend the south and east boundaries of the Mount Rainier National Park, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah calls up the bill H. R. 15008, and asks unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what does this bill do?

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I will state in answer to the gentleman from New York that it extends the boundaries of Mount Rainier National Park.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am familiar with the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the tract of land within the following-described boundaries be, and the same is hereby, excluded from the Rainier National Forest and is hereby added to and made a part of the Mount Rainier National Park, in the State of Washington:

Beginning at a point on the present east boundary of Mount Rainier National Park $1\frac{1}{4}$ miles southerly from the northeast corner of the said park as fixed by the act of May 28, 1926 (44 Stat. 668); thence extending east to the summit of the hydrographic divide between Silver Creek and White River; thence along the summit of Crystal Mountain to the summit of the Cascade Mountains; thence southerly along the summit of the Cascade Mountains to a point in section 20, township 15 north, range 11 east, Willamette meridian, whence flow the waters of Bumping River to the east and Carlton and Cougar Creeks to the south and west; thence southwesterly along the summit of the divide between Carlton Creek and the waters flowing into the main fork of Ohanapecosh River to the quarter section line of section 9, township 14 north, range 10 east, Willamette meridian; thence westerly along the quarter section line of sections 9, 8, and 7 to the west boundary of said township; thence due west to the right or west bank of Muddy Fork of the Cowlitz River; thence northerly along the right bank of said Muddy Fork to a point exactly due east of post No. 34 on the south boundary of Mount Rainier National Park as surveyed in 1908; thence due west to said post No. 34; thence along the boundary of said park as surveyed in 1908 to post No. 35; thence easterly along the south boundary of said national park as surveyed in 1908 to the southeast corner thereof; thence northerly along the east boundary of said national park as surveyed in 1908 to post No. 59; thence along the east boundary of said park as revised by the act of May 28, 1928, supra, due north to the point of beginning.

SEC. 2. All laws applicable to and in force within the Mount Rainier National Park as of the date hereof, and all regulations issued pursuant thereto, are hereby made applicable to and extended over the land added to the park by this act.

With the following committee amendments:

In line 3, page 3, strike out the words "due north" and insert in lieu thereof the word "northerly."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

In line 8, page 3, after the word "the," where it occurs the second time, insert the word "said," and in line 9, after the word "act," insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That no fee or charge shall be made by the United States for the use of any roads in said park built and maintained exclusively by the State of Washington."

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the committee amendment beginning in line 9 does not cover quite what the Park Service desires, so I am sending an amendment to the committee amendment to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment to the committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: On page 3, after the word "act" strike out the committee amendment and insert: "Provided, That no fee or charge shall be made by the United States for the use of any roads in said park built or maintained exclusively by the State of Washington."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD explaining the purpose of the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this bill extending the boundaries of Mount Rainier National Park has the approval of the Forest Service, the Rainier National Park advisory board, and the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. Horace M. Albright, Director of the National Park Service, says:

This bill proposes to add lands totaling approximately 34,000 acres to the Mount Rainier National Park, State of Washington. The lands adjoin the south and east boundaries of the park.

This is a measure which if enacted into law would give Mount Rainier National Park a natural boundary on the east, the boundary that it should have had at the time the park was first established. No park boundary revision project now under consideration by the National Park Service has more merit or is of greater importance than the one covered by this legislation.

Several purposes would be served by this boundary revision if approved by Congress, aside from giving the park the summit of the Cascades as a natural eastern boundary. Chinook Pass

through which the new road from Yakima to Seattle runs would become a spectacular gateway to the park and no park would have a finer entrance than this new eastern gateway to Mount Rainier. Here we would establish an information service which would tell the story of the park and give visitors all required data regarding facilities in the park for their accommodation and amusement, as well as maps and pamphlets to guide visitors in their enjoyment of the park features.

It is also of importance that this legislation be passed in order that the National Park Service may build its road connecting Paradise Valley and Yakima Park. It is necessary to build this road from the Paradise Valley region southeasterly through Stevens Canyon, thence over Cowlitz Ridge and up the Ohanapechosh River and Chinook Creek to a connection with the new State highway coming through Chinook Pass. Our road plans are responsible for the suggested extension along the southern boundary, which includes also Ohanapechosh Hot Springs. All of the land covered by the pending bill is within the Rainier National Forest. So far as we can ascertain there are no private holdings in the area and no commercial use of the lands may be reasonably expected in the future. Much of the timber has been burned and what remains does not appear to have commercial value. It is extremely important that there be no cutting of timber in these narrow valleys through which our scenic roads must run. The timber screen is very essential to the preservation of scenic resources.

The National Park Service is confident that the lands involved in this contemplated extension have greater public value from a scenic standpoint than for economic development.

PERMITS TO USE NATIONAL-FOREST LANDS

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 13547) to safeguard the validity of permits to use national-forest lands. This bill is on the House Calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah calls up a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H. R. 13547

A bill to safeguard the validity of permits to use national-forest lands

Be it enacted, etc., That where a special-use permit to use a tract of national forest land has been issued under the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture, the land so rented shall not be subject to appropriation, entry, alienation, or adverse use or occupancy unless such permit is discontinued or revoked.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That where a special-use permit to use, for other than pasture purposes, a tract of land not exceeding 160 acres in area, in the San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests has been issued under the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture, the land so rented shall not be subject to appropriation, entry, alienation, or adverse use or occupancy unless such permit is discontinued or revoked."

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill even though the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING], and I well know of his great interest and friendliness to the mining developments of California, advises me that he does not intend this measure to create a precedent for the further restriction of mining developments in the forest reserve. I shall vote against it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It seems to me that the fears expressed by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT] are in no way avoided by the language in the bill.

Mr. SWING. What was the statement of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT] says that it does not establish a precedent. This would be the first time in the history of legislation that bills we pass do not establish a precedent. This bill does establish a precedent.

Mr. SWING. This is the situation: We have a very heavy population in southern California, but a limited area of timberland. Practically the only mountain recreational area is within the national forests. Most of the lands are without timber growth that would furnish any kind of recreational area. As stated in the report, last year by actual count there were 2,000,000 persons entered these two national forests.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is this to be specially used for recreational purposes?

Mr. SWING. Special-use permits are issued by the Forest Service in this area largely for cabin sites. There are a great many of them in these two national forests. The bill

reserves about 1 per cent of the area of these national forests for the recreational use of 99 per cent of the public, leaving open 99 per cent of the area of the forests for the mining use of 1 per cent of the public. The miners can not complain. I trust there will be no objection to the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Committee on Public Lands have very generously agreed to give us the remainder of the afternoon for consideration of an appropriation bill. They have about half completed their calendar and will finish it on next Wednesday. I now ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday business be dispensed with for the remainder of the day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Connecticut when we may expect consideration of the Private Calendar?

Mr. TILSON. I have been trying to arrange for an evening session for that purpose, but it has been somewhat difficult, owing to the engagements of different Members. I now have an agreement which I think will enable me to secure unanimous consent that on Friday evening of next week, January 23, the entire evening be devoted to business on the Private Calendar. I had intended to ask for this when there is a larger attendance.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman will recollect that prior to the holiday recess I made a similar inquiry, and if the gentleman will look at the RECORD he will see that he then gave assurance that in the early part of January he would ask for a day to consider the Private Calendar.

Mr. TILSON. I have done my best to arrange for an evening. The gentleman realizes that it must be by unanimous consent or by rule.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman expect to ask for another day within the month to consider the Private Calendar?

Mr. TILSON. After the appropriation bills have gone to the Senate I shall even more vigorously strive for an opportunity for further consideration of the Private Calendar.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman realizes that the appropriation bills may not all be passed by the middle of next month?

Mr. TILSON. Oh, I think they should be passed before that time.

Mr. GARNER. I am hoping so myself. I would like to see them passed by then; but I do earnestly urge the gentleman to use every possible endeavor that he can to get an opportunity to consider the Private Calendar.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I shall withhold my request to dispense with the business on Calendar Wednesday for the moment and ask unanimous consent that on Friday evening, January 23, a session of the House may be held at which business on the Private Calendar shall be in order, and that at such session bills on the Private Calendar not objected to may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. GARNER. Beginning at the star?

Mr. TILSON. No; this time I think we should begin at the beginning of the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut withholds his former unanimous-consent request and asks unanimous consent that on the evening of the 23d day of January bills on the Private Calendar may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think the gentleman ought to allow us to commence at

the star, because some of us have had bills on the calendar that have been pending for a number of months. To begin at the beginning of the calendar possibly would prevent us from having bills considered at this session.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman must realize that some of these bills were passed over under conditions when objected to that would not obtain now, and some of the Members are insisting that these bills be given another chance. This is the reason I ask that we begin at the beginning of the calendar.

Mr. GLOVER. Would it not be fair to begin at the star and then return to the beginning?

Mr. TILSON. Not for the first call. I anticipate that we shall not go back further than the star for the remainder of any session devoted to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GARNER. That is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair suggests to the gentleman from Connecticut that the time when the evening session shall begin should be embodied in the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, in order to make my request complete, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday, January 23, it may be in order to move to take a recess until the evening of that day, at which time bills unobjected on the Private Calendar may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole, beginning at the beginning of the calendar.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, for the time being I object.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. TILSON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I renew my request to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business for the rest of the day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that for the remainder of the day business in order on Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 15593) making appropriations for the military and non-military activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Army appropriation bill, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, when the Air Corps item was read yesterday a request was made that we pass it over, to be returned to later. I now ask that we return to the Air Corps item to consider any amendments that may be offered to that item at this time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment pending to that item.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I think some limit should be placed on the debate on this amendment, and in order to get the matter before the members of the committee I ask unanimous consent that debate upon the Taber amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 30 minutes, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Mississippi and myself.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I reserve the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman mean debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto?

Mr. BARBOUR. I make the request that the time be equally divided between those for and against the amendment, because, as I understand it, the gentleman from Mississippi and I are on the same side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will take care of that. It is in the discretion of the Chair, and the Chair would rely on proponents on either side to inform the Chair in respect to their desire to speak.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I would like to be considered for five minutes during the time allowed.

Mr. TABER. I would like seven minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like eight minutes, and I would suggest that the time be extended to 40 minutes.

Mr. BARBOUR. I ask that the time be extended to 40 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, this is a very controversial amendment. A number of Members of the House desire to speak upon it, and I doubt very much whether 40 minutes will be sufficient to accommodate those gentlemen who desire to speak. Under the circumstances I shall for the present object.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Surely.

Mr. TABER. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I want to be assured of at least five minutes, and perhaps longer than that. It depends entirely upon what points are covered by other gentlemen speaking on their side of the question.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the gentleman realize that it is wise to have a limit of time placed?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I will have no objection to a later agreement, or as soon as I can find out what demands are going to be made for time and whether or not these gentlemen who wish to speak on the subject are given the opportunity.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. May I suggest that if the gentlemen who are here now who want time will make their wants known we can fix a limit accordingly?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I have no desire whatever to unnecessarily prolong debate or take up the time of the committee. I want at least five minutes, and possibly a little more than that.

Mr. CRAMTON. I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I should like to be placed in support of the Taber amendment for eight minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can only recognize a Member for five minutes under the 5-minute rule unless it is agreed upon now.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think it might be agreed upon now, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I would like to be recognized for eight minutes in opposition to the Taber amendment, if my colleague from Wisconsin is allowed eight minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thus far has noted the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF], the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA], the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I would like five minutes.

Mr. CLAGUE. I would like five minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think the Chair ought to know who are for and who are against the amendment so that the time may be evenly divided. As I understand, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], are in favor of the amendment and the other gentlemen are opposed to it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] in favor of or opposed to the amendment?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Allowing only 5 minutes for each, the Chair has noted the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF], 5 minutes; the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA], 5 minutes; the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], 5 minutes; the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], 5 minutes; the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], 5 minutes; the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS], 5 minutes; and the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR], 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Suppose the gentlemen, other than the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and the gentleman

from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], have five minutes each; how much time would that be?

Mr. CLAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I asked for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be 40 minutes; 5 minutes each.

Mr. BARBOUR. Thirty minutes on one side and 10 minutes on the other?

Mr. TABER. We should have more than 10 minutes as against 30 minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. As I understand, there are six Members opposed to the amendment who desire to speak five minutes each. Six Members with five minutes each opposed to the amendment. Would not the gentleman from California ask for a limit of one hour? That would give those in favor of the amendment the same time as those opposed.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, then I ask unanimous consent that the debate be limited to one hour, one half to be allotted to those opposed and one half to those in favor of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. This would leave five minutes each for the six gentlemen who will oppose the amendment.

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes. And those in favor of the amendment can divide their time as they see fit.

The CHAIRMAN. Only two have spoken for time in favor of the amendment, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. COLLINS. Before we make that agreement, is the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] certain that all of the gentlemen whose names are mentioned are opposed to the amendment?

Mr. BARBOUR. I understand they are.

Mr. COLLINS. Is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] opposed to the amendment?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] opposed to the amendment?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I am opposed to the Taber amendment; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] are to be allotted 15 minutes each. Is that understood?

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the amendment as follows:

Amendment by Mr. TABER: Page 32, line 12, strike out "\$31,679,635" and insert in lieu thereof "\$31,479,635"; on page 32, line 16, strike out "\$2,510,377" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,310,377."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the understanding, would it be necessary to use all the time allotted to the gentleman in favor of the amendment on one occasion?

The CHAIRMAN. It could be reserved, of course.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have offered this amendment to cut out the proposition of spending \$200,000 for a metal-clad dirigible of 3,800,000 cubic feet capacity. I have offered that amendment because I believe it is absolutely unnecessary for the Government at this time to spend this money.

I will briefly state the reasons why it ought not to be in the bill. In the first place, there is no Budget estimate for it; in the second place, it is not asked for by the Army; in the third place, it proposed to build an airship of duralumin—a metal. That metal has never been properly tested so that anyone can say that it is a safe proposition to build a ship of that character and of that size and involving, as it will before we get through, a hangar and all, \$10,000,000. At the present time the Navy has a 200,000-cubic-foot capacity ship of duralumin. That ship has been in service only since September 1, 1929.

It is said it is not embarking upon the construction of the ship, but this is the picture:

The Army and the Navy Air Corps tell us—and their statement is in the RECORD—that it is absolutely useless to spend this money on plans and development unless we are planning to build a ship; and that if we are planning to build a ship, the plans and development ought to go hand in hand with construction.

What is the dirigible situation in this country to-day? We are building two big Zeppelins in Ohio, near Akron. They are of 6,500,000 cubic feet capacity. They are being built for the Navy and under the supervision of the Navy. It has been understood for years that the Navy should have charge of dirigible construction. That means rigid airship construction. It is now proposed to turn that over to the Army, also, which will result in duplication. There is not any reason under the heavens why that should be done.

The two dirigibles which are now under construction at Akron will determine absolutely whether or not there is any need whatsoever for these ships in either the Army or the Navy for military purposes. It is absolutely a waste of money for us to go ahead and get into this metal-clad dirigible proposition and have the Army do it, because it will be a duplication of effort.

Many big engineers are interested in this proposition. This proposition has been supported by, I think, a persistent lobby. I think I can say just that, and I will not say any more. It is a sort of chamber of commerce proposition. It is a proposition that is not based on any desire of the Army or of the Navy. It is based on a promotion proposition. They tell us it will encourage a great engineering exploit. This is not the first time this Government has been asked to encourage this same proposition. In 1926, when we were considering the 1927 appropriation bill for the Navy, these same people came here with the same story, and there was appropriated for them \$300,000 in order to carry on and keep their organization together. As a result this metal-clad airship has been delivered to the Navy and the Navy has tested it to some extent. But this duralumin has certain drawbacks.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the all-metal airship which is in the hands of the Navy is constructed of pure duralumin?

Mr. TABER. Oh, it is an alloy. Duralumin is an alloy. It is as nearly pure duralumin as anything else ever could be.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Oh, no.

Mr. TABER. It is an alloy of aluminum and a number of other metals. It is a coined word which was adopted in order to cover this particular metal.

Mr. WOODRUFF. May I ask my friend from New York how rapidly the metal of which this ship is manufactured corrodes?

Mr. TABER. The estimated life of duralumin, according to the Army Air Corps, is around five years, while the cloth skin that is on the *Los Angeles* has already stood eight, without any substantial change. The cloth skin that is going on the new dirigibles is of a better quality and better grade. It is supposed to be better treated and is supposed to have a longer life.

In addition to that it is lighter and does not require so much weight to take away from the lifting capacity of the ship. The new-type duralumin ship, which the engineers here propose to build, has to have braces in it, similar to those in the silk-covered Zeppelins which are building at Akron; perhaps not so many but a large number of them. Therefore the lifting capacity for that size of metal-clad ships in all probability will be very seriously reduced.

This duralumin is supposed to corrode. The suspicions on the part of the authorities are such that they have already taken a chunk of the 200,000-cubic-foot ship out and it is now at the Bureau of Standards for testing.

Now, to show you how it is going to work out. The general opinion of those who have made a special study of lighter-

than-air work is that it is less durable than the silk covering.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Does the gentleman know that that opinion is expressed by anyone other than those interested in building the ships that are being built at Akron?

Mr. TABER. Oh, yes. The Navy people and the Army people, who have no interest in it except that of the Government, express that opinion.

A great many letters are being sent by big engineers in favor of this project, but a large number of them—I will not say all of them—show that they do not understand what is up, because they tell us that the helium is to be contained in this metal hull instead of in gas bags, like in the Zeppelins, whereas Mr. Fritsche, the man who is promoting this proposition, comes before us and says they are going to have the same gas bags now used in the Zeppelins, so you can get around through the ship. They do not know how they are going to work it, but they are going into just that kind of a proposition.

A lot of the propaganda on the proposition is entirely misleading and is entirely out of order. The whole situation is this: We are doing enough to develop lighter-than-air ships in the work the Navy is doing. The Navy is working the thing out, and it has a large force of men well trained along that line. Why should we go into that kind of a proposition in the Army, which has no men trained along that line except those who have taken the Navy course at Lakehurst? They have had no experience with these dirigibles.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUFF. The Army owns many nonrigid, lighter-than-air ships which are operated every day.

Mr. TABER. But they are ships of 500,000 cubic feet capacity as against 6,500,000 cubic feet capacity for the new Navy ships.

Mr. WOODRUFF. But they are lighter-than-air ships?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUFF. And the principles of operation are exactly the same whether they are of 500,000 cubic feet capacity or 6,500,000 cubic feet capacity?

Mr. TABER. Not at all, and that shows the attitude of the promoters of this proposition. Those things are operated under pressure, and they have to have the pressure to make them rigid enough to go through the air.

This is purely a scheme to promote and keep going the industry at Detroit and have the Government pay for it, when, as a matter of fact, the Navy is already doing all that is necessary in order to promote lighter-than-air construction. It is carrying on experiments of a most expensive type, and going into it as much as we should. Why should we duplicate this whole thing and set up the same kind of organization in the Army when the Government departments themselves, for the first time in history, I believe, have had sense enough themselves to know that they should separate such activities and keep away from duplication? I think this is the most ridiculous thing that I have ever heard presented to the Congress.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Are there any metal-clad lighter-than-air ships in either of the services?

Mr. TABER. Just one; in the Navy.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Is that made of the same metal?

Mr. TABER. They do not know yet whether they would make it of the same metal or not. It has not been tried out and exposed to the elements enough for them to be able to tell.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Has the Army expressed any opinion as to the desirability of this?

Mr. TABER. The Army feels—and the gentleman can find this on page 1424 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—that it can not afford to have its money spent for this type of thing because it is not an item of high military priority. It feels that if we go into this we are going to spend four

and a half million dollars for the construction of the ship and probably four or five million dollars more for hangars and accessories, and that this will ultimately come out of the Air Corps budget.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Can the gentleman tell me why, then, this item found its way into the bill?

Mr. TABER. Because there was a persistent lobby; and let me give you a little of the history of that lobby. They came before the Naval Appropriations Committee last year and they asked us to consider it, and we did not consider it. They came before the Military Affairs Committee with a bill and they asked them to consider it, and they had hearings on it and the hearings have not been completed. They came before the Military Appropriations Committee this fall and without any adequate hearings, without getting the responsible officers of the Army or the Navy who have had experience in this sort of thing before them, our committee fell for the proposition of the promoters and reported the item. This is the history of the proposition.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. This item is for the purpose of making an appropriation to permit the engineers of the Army Air Corps to carry on experimental work which this company itself should be carrying on?

Mr. TABER. That is it; and which is now being carried on. For instance, they told us they wanted to build a cross section and send it down to Langley Field for test by the Committee on Aeronautics, and that job is now being done, as I am informed, without any appropriation of this kind. And this is not the first time, as I told the committee before, they have come here with the same kind of proposition. They came here in 1926 and they got \$300,000 for the construction of that small, 200,000-cubic-foot ship that is over here at Lakehurst. This was all along experimental lines.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Was a somewhat similar provision offered to the last Army appropriation bill in the form of an amendment?

Mr. TABER. Not that I recall.

Mr. COYLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. COYLE. Is it not the fact that the Navy would be perfectly willing to turn this first experimental, all-metal-clad ship over to the Army if the Army wanted it?

Mr. TABER. The Navy has never made any such statement. Mr. Fritsche has said, in a letter to Admiral Moffett, that he would assume they would not object to it, but Admiral Moffett did not say so, Secretary Ingalls did not say so, and, as a matter of fact, those who have considered it thoroughly and on its merits are opposed to it.

Mr. BARBOUR. That is, in the Navy.

Mr. TABER. And the Army.

Mr. BARBOUR. No; not the Army. I do not concede that, but I will concede that the Navy men are opposed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is finding it difficult to state reasons why this appropriation should not remain in this bill. Every Member of the House is aware of the fact that for a great many years there has been a controversy between the Army and the Navy as to whose responsibility it is to protect our coast and maintain our coast defenses.

Within the last two or three weeks there has been an agreement reached by the two branches of our national defense, and the substance of this agreement has been set forth in a news release, which I will ask the Clerk to read in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

JANUARY 9, 1931.

At a conference between the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Pratt, and the Chief of Staff of the Army, General MacArthur, an agreement of far-reaching importance was consummated governing the operations of the Army and Navy air forces during peace. Basing their conclusions on those fundamental principles of national defense, which should properly govern both services, the agreement reached leaves the air forces of each free to develop within well-defined limits and each with a separate and distinct mission.

The naval air force will be based on the fleet and move with it as an important element in solving the primary missions confronting the fleet. The Army air forces will be land based and employed as an essential element to the Army in the performance of its mission to defend the coasts both at home and in our overseas possessions, thus assuring the fleet absolute freedom of action without any responsibility for coast defense.

Up to this time no satisfactory line of demarcation had been evolved, but the discussions have resulted in a clearer evaluation of the fundamental principles involved in the use of the air weapon. The present agreement is being heralded as the beginning of the closest cooperation that has ever existed between the two great branches of our national defense. It is, therefore, welcomed with acclaim by the personnel of both the Army and the Navy.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Now, Mr. Chairman, the air services mentioned in this news release include both the heavier than air and the lighter than air. It states very explicitly that all air service of the Navy is released to accompany the fleet wherever the fleet may operate and that no responsibility rests upon the Navy for our coast defense. This leaves this defense, both in continental United States and in our distant possessions, in the hands of the Army, and I am going to tell the committee in as few words as I can, because my time is limited, the results of recent maneuvers which have taken place at Panama. These maneuvers and the results obtained bear very directly and very strongly upon the question now under discussion. They show the necessity of lighter-than-air ships in the hands of the Army if points such as the Panama Canal are to have the necessary protection.

These maneuvers were conducted to discover the strength or weakness of the defending force at the canal. We have, as you know, certain Army forces stationed there at all times. Reinforcing these was a portion of the fleet, including one of our aircraft carriers, giving to the defense of the canal at least 150 airplanes.

The attacking or hostile force was composed of the balance of the fleet, including the other aircraft carrier, which carried approximately 120 airplanes. This carrier, accompanied by a cruiser, came within 140 miles of Panama and in dead of night launched their 120 airplanes, every one of which proceeded to their objective, theoretically bombed and destroyed the locks, returned to its base without mishap and without one of the defending 150 airplanes at the canal ever getting off the ground to defend the locks. Had this happened in time of war our canal would have been completely destroyed without doing any damage whatsoever to the attacking forces. It must be clear that if we are going to remain in a position to defend the canal and other important strategic points we must place our Army and Navy in possession of equipment that will enable us at all times to keep constantly in touch with any hostile force which may approach these strategic points near enough to launch an attack against them.

An airplane attack against an objective can be launched and carried out successfully from an airplane carrier from three to four hundred miles distant from such an objective.

All students of aeronautical tactics realize that when a large number of planes are sent against any given point it is reasonably certain that some few will reach that point and accomplish the mission, notwithstanding the number of planes which may be brought against them in the air. The maneuvers demonstrated that if a defense from an enemy air attack against Panama is going to be 100 per cent perfect, that attack must be stopped before the airplanes leave the hostile aircraft carrier. The hostile aircraft carrier during these maneuvers easily evaded the surface ships which were patrolling the seas off the coast of Panama, came within striking distance, and demonstrated the weakness of the Panama defenses against an air attack.

The news release issued by the Army and the Navy, which has just been read by the Clerk, explicitly states that our coast defenses in continental United States and also our more distant possessions are solely in the hands of the Army. This branch of our national defense is at the present time utterly helpless against air attacks at Panama, at Pearl Harbor, at New York, San Francisco, Puget Sound, and other important points, because it has not the equipment to search

out and destroy such attacking forces before the attack can be launched.

The efficiency and practicability of lighter-than-air craft can no longer be challenged. It has been demonstrated that these ships can remain aloft indefinitely. It has been demonstrated that they can be refueled at sea thousands of miles from their base, if necessary. It has been demonstrated that they can take on, refuel, and release heavier-than-air craft at will. It must be clear that such a ship can act as a base for a patrolling heavier-than-air force for any section of the land or sea. It is the only equipment we have which can take to the air, search out, and keep in touch with a hostile naval or air force. It is the one thing we must have and have in numbers if we are going to preserve from destruction in time of war the vitally important strategic point at Panama and other points of strategic importance.

This, it seems to me, demands that the Army be equipped to perform this function, inasmuch as it is charged with the responsibility of the defense.

In my judgment, the time will soon be here when both the Army and the Navy will necessarily be equipped with many ships of this character. It is ridiculous that we who are interested in the development of this particular part of our national defense should be criticized for urging the utmost development possible in this new art. No matter how much experimentation is undertaken, we can not proceed too rapidly toward perfecting these ships. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations has been very wise in incorporating this item in the bill, and I hope and believe that the Committee of the Whole will show its approval of their action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HUDSON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been fixed by the committee, and the Chair would not be warranted in entertaining that motion.

Mr. CLAGUE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, there has been some talk here before the committee to the effect that the Army is not in favor of metal airships or anything that pertains to this particular item. I do not understand that to be true. I happen to be a member of the subcommittee. It is true Mr. Davison or some member connected with the Army stated that they did not wish to take any part of the appropriation, the amount that the Budget recommended, for experimental purposes for metal airships. But there is no statement within my memory by any person connected with the Army that they were not in favor of having this experimental work continued.

It has been stated that we must not make any appropriation which has not been approved by the Budget committee. I want to say now, as I have said before, that I am not going to be a rubber stamp for the Budget committee. If I think we ought to make an honest appropriation, I am going to vote for that appropriation. [Applause.]

Now, what is the purpose of this particular appropriation? It is not for the purpose of building a metal airship. What is before us is simply investigation and research work in relation to duralumin. This appropriation of \$200,000 is for experimental purposes, trying to develop this material to determine if it is a fit and proper metal to go into metal ships. I am really surprised that we did not have more money in the bill for experimental purposes. We are appropriating \$75,000,000 for Army Air Service, and we only have two and one-quarter million dollars for experimental purposes. We are appropriating about \$340,000,000 for the Army, and I feel and honestly believe that we could take \$10,000,000 of that sum for experimental purposes and use it for better purposes than we are now doing.

Our air forces are not in the best condition. I want to speak for a moment about the engines we use. We have for small airships wonderful engines, but the larger types are not the best. England and France have much better larger engines than we have. They have developed the Rolls-Royce engine, a large airplane engine, much superior to any

engine now used in the United States. I wish we had in the bill a million dollars more for experimental purposes for the development of larger and better airplane engines.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLAGUE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. In the hearings was any effort made to determine the attitude of the War Department?

Mr. CLAGUE. We had Mr. Davison before us and he stated that he did not want this item to come out of the regular appropriation.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. How much time was devoted to an inquiry for that purpose?

Mr. CLAGUE. Oh, perhaps two hours altogether.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. As I read the hearings there were 15 or 20 pages devoted to the proponents and only 2 or 3 questions asked of the War Department.

Mr. CLAGUE. Oh, there were more than that.

Mr. HUDSON. Secretary Davison said that he did not want the regular appropriations to be used for this purpose.

Mr. CLAGUE. It is an item of only \$200,000 that is suggested to be devoted to experimental purposes.

Mr. KELLY. And is it not true that every dollar of this experimental purpose may result in the saving of hundreds of thousands of dollars?

Mr. CLAGUE. Yes. The item in question is only \$200,000. It is to be spent for a worthy purpose. The amendment offered should be defeated.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, since I have only about five minutes and have an hour's speech to make, I ask not to be interrupted. This item has to do with experimentation, with the development of plans which, if, after study, are deemed feasible, would logically lead to the construction of a metal-clad airship. Let me first say that while the company that carries on this work is in Detroit, I have no personal or political interest in it. None of them has ever done me any favor that I know of, or is likely to. I am interested in it as one step in a logical program of national defense. First, let me emphasize this to you as to the field of aviation. There is the field of heavier-than-air craft on which this Government and our people have expended in experimentation, development, and construction in war and in peace, military and commercial, something like \$3,000,000,000. Then you come to the lighter-than-air field, which consists on the one hand of the fabric-clad ship, and on the other of the metal-clad ship. As to the fabric-clad ship, the Government is carrying on very full experiments as the gentleman from New York has said. We have spent about \$60,000,000 on the fabric-clad, lighter-than-air ship. I submit that no real study of this important problem that might come to the very forefront in another war will wisely ignore the question of the feasibility and possibilities of metal-clad aircraft. As against \$3,000,000,000 for heavier-than-air craft, as against \$60,000,000 for fabric clad, how much have we expended as yet on metal clad? Three hundred thousand dollars only toward the production of one small ship that cost nearly \$1,000,000 to produce, and these gentlemen in Detroit in their experimentation donated the balance and the Government has the ship. It is now in successful use.

After that first experiment, what does the Navy say about it? They say, "The airship has been flown more than the 30 hours required by the contract and has equaled or bettered all performance requirements of the contract." Have not those people who have donated two-thirds of the cost of the first step in the experiment a right to come to the Congress and suggest a continuance of the experiment?

Furthermore, who proposes it? A "persistent lobby," it is said. One gentleman was before the committee with myself, and that is the "persistent lobby." They are asking recognition, as other great inventors have had to peddle their ideas from bureau to bureau in order to get some part of the Government to take up something new. Finally we went to the subcommittee on this Army appropriation bill, made up of good, common-sense men, who are not easily overcome by any "persistent lobby," and that subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, by a vote of 4 to 1, have approved of this item. This organization is not a chamber of com-

merce. These are men who put up their own money to the extent of \$2,000,000 so far in experimentation and construction of plant.

Mr. William B. Mayo, the general engineer of the Ford Motor Co.; Mr. C. F. Kettering, vice president of the General Motors Corporation; noted engineers, scientists, and executives, have gotten together in an effort to develop this, hoping that in another generation possibly there may be some money in it, but not with any foolish idea that there is now any profit to be had. This ship now proposed, as against the 200,000 cubic feet of the one already built, is to be of 3,800,000 cubic feet, about twenty times the size of the first experiment. That is the natural progressive step in this experiment, and these engineers are offering to put their engineers' time up against the time of the Government engineers. How can they plan a great ship like that for military use unless the Army military experts sit in and say what is necessary in order to equip it properly and plan it for the best military use. I hope the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, if I may, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COYLE].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be recognized for two minutes.

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I was present in the Sixty-ninth Congress when the representations were made before the Committee on Appropriations, and not the legislative committee of the Navy, by this Detroit corporation in order to get the first experimental metal-clad ship. It was a close line on a point of order as to whether or not it was legislation in an appropriation bill, and if you will look back at the RECORD of that time you will find that the appropriation was authorized for the single reason that this was a small experimental boat, to all intents and purposes, and not a great ship, but was purely for experimental purposes, and the first one. Therefore it got by in an appropriation bill. Not on either occasion has this company from Detroit appeared before the legislative committee with the request that the merits of this particular type of vessel be gone into by the legislative committee, and accordingly to-day we are confounded by a precedent of four years ago. I submit that this appropriation should not pass, because it verges very closely on the line of authorization, and the merits of the proposition ought to be tried out before a legislative committee and not on the floor of the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be notified at the end of eight minutes. If this subject had not been given partial provisional consideration before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House I would very probably be under the impression that it is a feasible proposition. The men connected with this Detroit company sponsoring this activity came before the committee and we gave them a hearing. That hearing disclosed nothing of the mechanical structure other than the metal-clad outer covering. Following that hearing I had occasion to talk with a prominent electrical engineer as to the feasibility of this metal-clad ship.

He pointed out that the weakness of the metal-clad ship was in the riveting; that in case of a storm the wind would rip it and the helium would escape.

I then later took the matter up with the Navy Department and called upon Admiral Moffett to state the difference in the construction between the Zeppelin type *Akron* that is now being constructed at Akron, Ohio, and this ship. The Zeppelins that are in use and are being constructed are provided with cylindrical bags suspended inside of a large cylinder frame, which bags contain the helium and provide the buoyancy. In the metal-clad ship all the helium is contained in one large chamber and the danger is that the helium will leak out through corrosion of the thin aluminum plates, or more probably through ripping of the seams in stress of storms.

The department is strongly opposed to this type of metal-clad ship. Under an agreement between the Army and Navy all experimentation as far as lighter-than-air ships is concerned was to be undertaken by the Navy, and that is

going on because that character of service is more valuable to the Navy than to the Army. The Army questions the practicability of this character of ship for use in the Army.

Let me read the testimony of Major Hickam, of the general staff of the aircraft:

There has been a great deal of difference of opinion as to whether the airship was capable of transporting weapons and of employing force in the air or from the air, or whether or not it could be used for observation purposes.

That is the opinion of the expert of the War Department.

The Assistant Secretary of War in Charge of Aviation, Mr. Davison, testified before the Appropriations Committee. Bear in mind that this was in the closing hours of the hearings on this bill, on December 12. It was a late afterthought that occurred to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cramton] to have this incorporated after the company officials had been refused recognition by the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs, the legislative committees of the House. Mr. Davison says: "No, sir; we do not." He was asked this question:

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Secretary, do you think that this proposal for that research and development work is of such importance that you would feel that it was advisable to use some of this money in the estimates for the nonrigid program for 1932 for that purpose?

Mr. DAVISON. No, sir; we do not; because we think that the other things are more important. Even some of the things that we have left out of the experimental program are more important.

I have a letter dated January 9 from the Acting Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics of the Navy Department in which he says:

In some ways a large metal-clad airship must depart from the features incorporated in the small airship which the Navy Department now has. As an example, the small airship has a single gas compartment. The larger airship must have several such compartments. This involves partitions of some sort and the arrangement and behavior of these partitions is of importance. Therefore to assume that large metal-clad airship will be "similar" to the small ship we now have, is not justified. * * *

It might be remarked in passing, it is believed that in overcoming these difficulties the trend of development will be away from the "pressure principle" and toward the type of airship which the Navy Department is now building, which type has a considerable background of successful experience.

That is the Zeppelin dirigible, which has been in use for 25 years, and which is maintained by cylindrical bags inside of the frame where a person can walk and not interfere with the bags, whereas on this ship no one can walk, but the whole principle depends upon the strength of its outer covering; not upon the frame, as in the Zeppelin, a photograph of which was published in the New York Times of last week, and which I now show you. This shows that the strength of the Zeppelin depends upon the structural frame, and the bags that contain the helium, 12 or 15 in number, are suspended inside.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I decline to yield.

The outer covering of the Zeppelin type can be penetrated and the Zeppelin will continue to navigate, because there may be no infraction of the cylindrical bags that contain the helium or the suspending buoyant power; whereas, as far as the metal-clad frame is concerned, that depends for its strength entirely on the outer shell itself. If that is penetrated, the ship will have to come down, because the outer casing is the container that holds the helium.

A further argument: Four years ago, in 1926, when this matter was first considered by the Committee on Appropriations, after the legislative committees had refused to consider it, the representatives of this same company stated in answer to a question as to why they did not develop this commercially, that this would be the only instance where they would call upon Congress. We have only had the smaller-type ship in use since September last, 16 months, and only recently, within the last few days, the plates have been taken off to test the corrosion qualities of this sheet metal, which is the sustaining characteristic. If Congress is going into every stock-jobbing proposition for experimentation in all kinds of proposals in opposition to the expressed will of the department, the head of the Navy Department

who is in charge of aeronautics, the head of the War Department in charge of aeronautics, we are going to be beset with similar propositions such as this that emanates from Michigan. There is no one here who is desirous of trying to thwart the extension of lighter-than-air ships. The committee has determined that that should be determined by that branch of the service where they will be most useful—that is, the Navy. Why should we undertake here to launch into an experiment that will cost the Government \$5,000,000? That is the estimate of the cost of this metal-clad ship. It is launching into a field of activity where the Government will be holding an unusable white elephant.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, the great interest in this proposition is something more than national defense. It is a new method of transportation. Now, the mere fact that the Army can not see the purpose of this experiment or the Navy can not see the purpose of it is in and of itself sufficient and good reason for Congress to act. [Applause.] The Navy refused the Ericsson propeller and resisted it and fought it, and finally when they were compelled to take it they refused to pay for it. You gentlemen who were here immediately after the war still remember that the Navy insisted upon the battleship and claimed that aviation was of no purpose, and General Mitchell had to sacrifice his military career to demonstrate to the country that the Navy was wrong; and some of the other gentlemen will remember, and I am sure the distinguished gentleman who is now in the chair will remember that the Army refused the Lewis machine gun and would not have anything to do with it until England adopted it and used it. And who does not remember the original rejection of the Holland submarine and the Lake submarine.

The Army refused aviation in the days of Selfridge and said we could never replace the cavalry for reconnaissance.

We all marveled when the great *Graf Zeppelin* circumnavigated the globe and successfully crossed the Atlantic several times, but remember, gentlemen, that in the wake of the *Graf Zeppelin* there were scores and scores of experimental ships that were destroyed. A great many of you will remember the rigid dirigible *Roma*, which we purchased from Italy, and when the Army put new motors in it and tried to increase her speed she went to pieces. That, too, was experimental. You will remember the *Shenandoah*, which we copied from the *Los Angeles*, and which was built on the same plans as those used by the Germans, and yet she fell apart. You all well remember what happened only a few weeks ago to the new dirigible manufactured by England. It went to pieces. Lighter-than-air ships are still in their infancy. We have yet a lot to learn. Experimentation and research are absolutely necessary.

This is a new art and it requires a great deal of costly research and experimentation.

I wonder how many gentlemen in the House know—although I suspect the gentleman from Wisconsin knows—that every time we build a new plane we actually must build one and break it before it is put into use. Every structural piece of a plane before it is put into the air is put to a strength test in order to establish its actual strength. So it is with a new-type airship. There are many engineering features which must be studied. It will all result for the benefit of the art and the good of the country.

This question of a metal ship is still new in the art. It is so costly that none of the countries can afford at this time to experiment with it. Such experimentation is extremely useful, necessary, and interesting. This appropriation for the purpose of carrying on the necessary engineering experiments, scientific research, and tests necessary to determine the feasibility of a metal-clad airship is not only for the good of national defense but for the art of aerial navigation.

Gentlemen, if this were an appropriation on an agricultural bill to experiment with some new seed, there would not be any question about it. Not at all. I can not understand how there can be any real opposition to this proposition.

We can not enter into the engineering features of this new ship in such detail as did the gentleman from Wisconsin. That is not our function. It is not our business to build the ship here this afternoon. All we have to provide are the necessary funds in order to carry on the experiments and let the engineers do the rest.

Permit me to say to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania that any member of the Naval Affairs Legislative Committee is the last person on earth to come on this floor and try to cut out any appropriations for experimental purposes. That committee never hesitates to ask for hundreds of millions of dollars whenever asked to do so by the Navy Department. In a few days that committee will ask this House to appropriate \$30,000,000 for the remodeling of obsolete battleships, which that committee ought to know are obsolete to-day. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the substantive law provides that the Secretary of War is authorized to equip and maintain an Air Corps, with equipment not to exceed 1,800 serviceable airplanes and such numbers of airships, free and captive balloons, and so forth, as seem proper. So we have ample authority for the item that is carried in this bill.

With reference to that item, let me say that the airplane is the taxi of the air. Operating within a radius of 800 miles, the airplane is the agency in which ordinary travel will be conducted. The dirigible is the freight train of the air and, in addition to that, the dirigible is the agency in which human beings will travel long distances by air in the future. So, then, in order to have a balanced air program we should have not only airplanes but we should have dirigibles as well.

Mr. Mitchell, while Assistant Secretary of Aviation, when these bombing experiments were conducted 8 or 10 years ago off the Virginia Capes and when ships, including the *Auf Friesland*, were sunk, stated that the airplane carriers of the future would not be surface ships but would be metal-clad dirigibles.

I want to say to you gentlemen that one of the most worth-while items of national defense, in my judgment, in this bill is this metal-clad airship. [Applause.] We do not necessarily want personnel in our Army.

If we are to maintain military national defense in this country we should have a modern fighting army. In order to have such we must provide ourselves with modern fighting implements. So there is no sense in increasing personnel at the expense of modern fighting machines, and this is a modern fighting implement.

Now, certain gentlemen have seen fit to criticize this particular dirigible. Every year there is awarded what is known as the Wright brothers medal. This medal is awarded annually for the outstanding contribution to aeronautics. In 1929 this award was made to this metal-clad dirigible by the judgment of a board of outstanding scientists and engineers.

Now, let us find out from another source the value of this agency. The Navy Department's official report on this metal-clad airship, conducted from August 19 to September 25, 1929, said:

In accordance with references (a) and (b) trials have been conducted to determine whether the ZMC-2 airship meets the contract guarantees. The airship has been flown more than the 30 hours required by contract and has equaled or bettered all performance requirements of the contract—

And so forth. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, as I understand there is 10 minutes remaining, 5 minutes in opposition and 5 minutes in favor of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct, and the gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield for that purpose?

Mr. PARKS. I thought a parliamentary inquiry was ordinarily in order at any time.

The CHAIRMAN. No; the gentleman is mistaken about that—not after the gentleman has been recognized.

Mr. PARKS. Then may I propound my parliamentary inquiry after the gentleman from Wisconsin has finished?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will be glad to yield at the conclusion of my remarks for that purpose. [Laughter.]

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to me for just a second?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I wish to read what Assistant Secretary of War Davison said on this proposition in answer to questions which I submitted to him.

The War Department has reported unfavorably on the project because:

(a) It does not feel that such a costly lighter-than-air project should be undertaken until its heavier-than-air requirements, which are more important from a national-defense point of view, have been completely taken care of.

(b) It considers the metal-clad airship to fall within the category of rigid airships and its development to be a function of the Navy Department in accordance with a joint agreement of the Army and Navy which assigns, for reasons of economy, the development of rigid airships to the Navy Department.

Mr. STAFFORD. And further in response to the questionnaire submitted by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to the Assistant Secretary of War, I call the attention of the committee to this question.

Could an appropriation of \$200,000 for plans, specifications, and experimental work in connection with metal-clad airships serve any useful purpose unless we shall determine to build and use one?

Listen, gentlemen, to the opinion that I think we should follow and not the president of some corporation that wants to get something from the Treasury for his company's private advantage.

I am reading the answer of Assistant Secretary of War Davison, found on page 1460 of the record:

The purchase of the experimental plans for this airship at this time is not warranted, unless it is intended to construct the airship if the design is approved. Long experience in aircraft construction has shown that the preparation of experimental plans and specifications, to be of substantial value, should go hand in hand with actual construction.

In the face of the opposition of the Assistant Secretary of War for Aviation, in the face of the position of the acting head of the Bureau of Aeronautics of the Navy in his letter of January 9 on this proposition, how can this Congress take a contrary position on a proposition supported primarily by some members of the committee from Michigan where this flattened industry is seeking some nursing on the part of the National Government.

Why, there is no patented principle involved in this metal-clad proposition, and if there is no patented principle involved, why has not Germany, which has been the forerunner in the development and construction of Zepps and lighter-than-air ships, taken up this plan? You all know the achievements of the *Graf Zeppelin* going around the world. Why have not other nations, like Great Britain and France, launched upon this proposal?

No; a few years ago we purchased this little toy balloon of 200,000 cubic feet for experimental purposes, and the Navy Department, after 16 months, has pointed out the defects in it by showing you, as I prefaced in my preliminary remarks, that in a metal-clad ship the helium is all in the upper part of the ship exposed to escape in case of a leak in the outer metal casing, whereas in the Zepp type the helium is contained in from 12 to 15 bags suspended in the interior of the metal frame construction which sustains the ship.

I am simply giving the committee the benefit of expert opinion obtained from the heads of the respective departments. No committee, not even the Committee on Appropriations, has gone into this question, and there is not one line of testimony before the Appropriations Committee or before any legislative committee as to the merits of the construction of these two types of ship; but there is before everybody who has given any serious study to this question

the fact that the lighter-than-air ship with a flexible light skin covering and with strong framework, as pointed out here in this picture, is the type that is accepted by all the air services of other powers; and now you are asking this Government, not merely for \$200,000, but you are asking virtually for us to purchase a ship for \$5,000,000 against the position of the heads of the respective bureaus of the Army and the Navy.

If this House, with this large audience, wishes to commit itself, when the project has been turned down virtually by each of the legislative committees, and when no investigation has been had before either of the legislative committees or the Appropriations Committee as to the structural advantages of the Zeppelin type over the metal-clad type, then you are setting yourselves up as the superior of the heads of our respective services. I have no special interest at all in fighting this matter other than the integrity of our appropriations from invasion by outside private interests. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PARKS. This morning I was asked by the majority leader whether or not I would object to the procedure which we were then following, which was under the Calendar Wednesday rule, and I said I certainly would not object to the bills that were then up for consideration.

I want to inquire whether he understood me to refrain for the entire day or only for Calendar Wednesday?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TILSON). The majority leader surely understood the gentleman from Arkansas to say that there would be an armistice for the day. [Laughter.] From the pacific attitude the gentleman has since maintained the majority leader has also hoped that instead of an armistice it might turn out to be a permanent and lasting peace. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it is not my purpose to take any great length of time in discussing this amendment, because it has been fully discussed, I believe, and all the important facts in regard to it have been brought out.

It has been argued that a legislative committee has not passed upon it. There is ample authority in current law at the present time and there is nothing for the legislative committee to authorize. It is fully authorized.

We are told that it is in conflict with the agreement between the War and Navy Departments as to the building and operation of airships. If newspaper reports can be relied upon, there is now an entirely new agreement between the Army and the Navy, entered into within the past few days, which supersedes any agreement they previously made, and now the aerial defense of the country over land is in control of the Army and at sea in control of the Navy. If the arguments heretofore made in favor of lighter-than-air craft are good, such aircraft are as useful over land as they are over the seas.

It has been contended that the heads of the War and Navy Departments do not approve of this expenditure. Assistant Secretary of War Davison has been quoted several times as to his attitude, but if anyone will take the trouble to read his reply to Mr. TABER's last question in the letter that has been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I believe you will find that this project has the approval of the Assistant Secretary of War. I am going to take the time to read what he said, for it will take but a moment.

In answer to question 6 he says:

Question 6. Will you give me your views as to what the committee should do with this proposition?

Answer. In this connection it is thought only fair to point out that this project is being fostered by competent engineers and business executives of national reputation, and it is apparent that these men have great faith in the ultimate success of this type of airship. Many difficult engineering problems will, no doubt, be encountered in the design and construction of such an airship. Similar problems are usually encountered in the design and construction of aircraft which are radically different from existing

types. In this case the first step—the ZMC-2—has proven a success from an experimental point of view up to the present time. In my opinion, the construction of the 100-ton metal-clad airship is the next logical step to be taken if the development of the metal-covered airship is to be continued. It is also my opinion that if this project is undertaken much will be learned which will be of value to the science of aerostatics. The War Department has reported unfavorably on the project because: * * *

Now, gentlemen, the proposition is simply this: We have been building in this country fabric-clad airships. It is believed by many that a metal-clad airship is safer and is not so liable to crack up, and that we will not have such terrible catastrophes as we have had with the fabric-clad ships. It is proposed to expend \$200,000 to find out if that is true, and, if possible, give the country something better than we have at the present time.

The *Roma* was a fabric-clad airship, as was the *Shenandoah* and the *R-101*, all of which were destroyed with most disastrous results. Let us see if we can not get something better. That is all the committee proposes to do—to spend \$200,000 to get, if we can, something better. It is for experimental purposes solely. If we can get better and safer airships I am in favor of going ahead and appropriating the money for that purpose. That is all we propose to do. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were 14 ayes and 96 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

All of the money hereinbefore appropriated for pay of the Military Academy shall be disbursed and accounted for as pay of the Military Academy, and for that purpose shall constitute one fund.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The headquarters of the American Legion, located at Indianapolis, Ind.—

Mr. BARBOUR rose.

Mr. PATMAN. I want to talk about military training. This item has to do with the Military Academy.

Mr. BARBOUR. The gentleman must confine himself to the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. I am going to confine my remarks to the bill. I have to get started to say anything.

Mr. BARBOUR. I think the gentleman has said enough to indicate to most of us that what he intends to say is not on this item.

Mr. PATMAN. Can the gentleman not see any connection between the American Legion and military training?

Mr. BARBOUR. I could 10 years ago; yes. We are discussing here a Military Academy item. I do not want to object to the gentleman's remarks, but I think he should confine himself to the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. I shall take only five minutes. In discussing the question of the training of future soldiers I think it is entirely in order to talk about doing justice to the soldiers who have already rendered service to the cause of their country.

Mr. BARBOUR. I think that is entirely beside the point.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will not object, I say frankly that I shall not take more than five minutes.

Mr. BARBOUR. Yesterday we ran into that situation. We did not object to one speaker who asked time, and we had 35 to 40 minutes here consumed in speeches that were not on the bill at all, and it delayed the bill just that much.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. I think we are going to have another appropriation bill on the floor to-morrow, and the gentleman can get all the time he wants then.

Mr. PATMAN. Would the gentleman object to my having two minutes out of order?

Mr. BARBOUR. No; I would not object to that, but the only thing I hope is that it will not be a precedent to others to ask unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I object to the gentleman talking out of order.

Mr. PATMAN. I think it is in order to talk about doing justice to people who have already rendered service to their country, when considering the matter of preparing soldiers for future service.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that the gentleman is trifling with the House.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope I am not doing that. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD a statement that was made in Foreign Service, the official organ of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, for last week.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made in Foreign Service, the official organ of the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

[From the January issue of Foreign Service, the national publication of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States]

Back in 1924 the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States held steadfast to the theory of a cash bonus as the logical method of compensating—at least in a measure—the World War veteran for the financial sacrifices he made during his period of service. This proposed bonus was designated to equalize, to some extent, the income of the man in uniform with that of the individual who received a war-time wage in the peaceful rôle of a civilian.

Unfortunately, however, Congress was deceived into believing an alternative proposition—involving adjusted service compensation certificates payable in 20 years or upon death—was acceptable to the average World War veteran.

When the trend of discussion back in 1924 indicated unsurmountable opposition to a cash bonus, certain politically minded veteran leaders sought to leap upon the administration bandwagon by posing as spokesmen for the World War veteran. These self-appointed guardians who in reality represented less than one-eighth of the total number of World War veterans, had the audacity to issue statements in behalf of more than 4,000,000 men. In their feverish desire to "play ball" with the politicians and also curry the favor of big business, these so-called champions of the veteran cause proclaimed to a credulous Congress that the veteran himself preferred an endowment policy rather than a bonus in the form of cash. The 20-year promissory note, Congress was also told, would help forestall demands for a World War service pension.

As was to be expected, those who opposed the suggestion of a World War bonus back in 1924, and were eventually forced to accept the adjusted compensation measure as a compromise, are to-day bitterly fighting the movement that would grant immediate cash payment. Secretary of the Treasury Andrew W. Mellon again has the distinction of leading the forces arrayed against the interests of the veteran. It was his influence at the White House 6 years ago that threatened a presidential veto to any cash bonus legislation adopted by Congress and it was this threat that resulted in the enactment of an endowment insurance plan.

Although the rank and file of World War veterans were desirous of immediate financial aid, in the form of a bonus that would give them a half decent opportunity to start life anew, Secretary Mellon and his cohorts (big business lobbyists who feared veteran appropriations might seriously interfere with pending income tax refunds, war contract rebates and other pet measures in which they were particularly interested) suddenly became altruistic. They were seized with a peculiar moral responsibility for the welfare of the veteran—not in 1925 when his privations were most acute—but in 1945 when the average World War veteran will be over 50 years of age and either financially independent or a resident of the National Soldiers Home, irrespective of a matured insurance policy or the insignificant residue that is left after repeated loans.

In a statement issued on December 4, designed to stem the tide of increasing sentiment in favor of immediate cash payment, Secretary Mellon harks back to his altruism of 1924—the value of the bonus as an endowment policy. He completely ignores the fact that out of 3,680,704 veterans in possession of these certificates, 2,294,161 have already found it necessary to nullify the benefits of their insurance policies by borrowing to the limit on the loan value available. To the veteran crying for bread to-day Secretary Mellon would give the promise of cake in 1945.

Other subterfuges employed by Secretary Mellon assert that the proposed plan for immediate cash payment of these certificates, at their face value in 1945, would be economically unsound and unwise, not only in relation to the veteran's own welfare but also to the best interests of the country at large.

However, there were selfish interests involved in this question back in 1924, aside from Mr. Mellon's economic views, and there is every reason to believe that these same selfish interests are still actively interested in defeat of the veteran bonus question to-day. In addition to the fact that other widely known economists disagree with Mr. Mellon and advocate immediate cash payment of

these bonus certificates as a logical and sane method of contending with present emergencies, it is natural that Mr. Mellon would want to be consistent with his initial objections. These conditions, therefore, explain in a measure the lack of confidence held by the average World War veteran in the views expounded by Mr. Mellon.

The World War veteran is not in favor of raiding the Treasury and is not to be classed as a Treasury looter. It is ridiculous to believe that the man who was willing to accept the paltry pay he received as a soldier, sailor, or marine in time of war would consent to any personal benefits that might threaten, in time of peace, the economic safety and security of the Nation as a whole. In his request for immediate cash payment of his World War bonus certificates he believes—with those who are considered authorities in matters of finance—that these obligations can be met without increasing the present burden of the individual taxpayer. Uncle Sam has resorted to bond issues on other occasions, when times were no more precarious nor the need greater. If bond issues were feasible then, they are feasible to-day. Moreover, the opportunity of having these issues retired in conjunction with the payment of allied war debts to the United States as they fall due is also available as a means of making this plan practical.

To-day the voice of the individual veteran is being heard. He has awakened from his postwar apathy toward legislative activity with the realization that he has been betrayed. He is asking in no uncertain terms for the cash bonus that was advocated by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States more than six years ago—and once again this organization stands vindicated as the standard bearer of the men who served.

A powerful ally to the cause of a cash bonus has appeared in the form of a distressing economic situation, born of widespread unemployment and decreased purchasing power on the part of the ultimate consumer. As a result, distribution of more than \$3,000,000,000 in cash through payment of these certificates is hailed by economists and business men alike as a solution to existing depression. Virtually every community would feel the stimulant of these funds, while the veteran and his dependents would be provided with necessities heretofore denied.

A few inevitable facts remain. The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is the only major veteran organization that has endorsed this movement at its national encampments. The Veterans of Foreign Wars is the only major veteran group that has carried its appeal in this behalf direct to President Hoover. The Veterans of Foreign Wars is the only major veteran body that has included immediate cash payment of compensation certificates in its legislative program laid before Congress for the past two years.

In fairness to himself and his comrades every eligible veteran should throw the weight of his support, in the form of active membership, to the organization that is fighting in his behalf. With a united front there is every opportunity for a victory, an achievement that will place the veterans on Uncle Sam's list of preferred creditors and once again repudiate those who would barter the welfare of America's ex-service men for a mess of political pottage.

The Clerk read as follows:

When approved by the Secretary of War 10 per cent of each of the foregoing amounts under the appropriation for "Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard" shall be available interchangeably for expenditure on the objects named, but no one item shall be increased by more than 10 per cent: *Provided*, That any such transfers shall be reported to Congress in the annual Budget.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Can the gentleman inform the committee as to the amount of turnover there is in the enlisted personnel in the National Guard?

Mr. BARBOUR. I think there is something in the hearings about that. The turnover is going on continually.

Mr. STAFFORD. Years ago when I was giving considerable attention to this subject, I was surprised to learn that the members of the National Guard were remaining on an average less than one year in the service. I am wondering whether that same short term of service still prevails.

Mr. BARBOUR. They are having no trouble in recruiting the National Guard and maintaining it at the strength provided in the appropriation bill? They do say that the turnover is going on all of the time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course, if the members of the National Guard remain only a few months in the service they get very little value from the training. The real value, as I see it, is during the two weeks of training at the summer camp. There they get intensive training. The training they get throughout the rest of the year in three nights a week amounts to little.

Mr. BARBOUR. Here is what General Everson says about it:

The present authorized strength is 190,000 officers and men and this additional 5,000 will bring the number up to 195,000. The actual strength on June 30, 1930, was 182,715, which is a little over 7,000 less than the authorized strength. This shortage is due

to the turnover in the National Guard units that is taking place all the time. When it is considered that the number is spread over 4,000 units, it is not excessive. It is less than an average of two men per unit.

I think in referring to average per unit he refers to the 5,000 new men that they expect to take in during the fiscal year 1932.

Mr. STAFFORD. What I have in mind is the average length of service of the enlisted personnel of the National Guard.

Mr. BARBOUR. I do not think there is anything in the hearings on that.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. It is three years in my State.

Mr. BARBOUR. They have an enlistment contract that controls that, unless there is some reason why they should be discharged. The enlistment contract calls for a 1 or a 3-year enlistment.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was under the impression that there was no bounden obligation on the part of the men to serve any specific term of years.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. There is in my State—three years.

Mr. BARBOUR. I understand that in all of the States they have to enlist for a certain period.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was rather surprised when I made a special inquiry as to this condition, to find the average length of service of the National Guard man was but one year.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I wonder how long it would be if we abolished the pay for drills?

Mr. STAFFORD. The recreational feature, then, would be entirely removed, and I question whether we would have the large enrollment as at present.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

ORGANIZED RESERVES

For pay and allowances of members of the Officers' Reserve Corps on active duty in accordance with law; mileage, reimbursement of actual traveling expenses, or per diem allowances in lieu thereof, as authorized by law: *Provided*, That the mileage allowance to members of the Officers' Reserve Corps when called into active service for training for 15 days or less shall not exceed 4 cents per mile; pay, transportation, subsistence, clothing, and medical and hospital treatment of members of the Enlisted Reserve Corps; conducting correspondence or extension courses for instruction of members of the Reserve Corps, including necessary supplies, procurement of maps and textbooks, and transportation and traveling expenses of employees; purchase of training manuals, including Government publications and blank forms, subscriptions to magazines and periodicals of a professional or technical nature; establishment, maintenance, and operation of divisional and regimental headquarters and of camps for training of the Organized Reserves; for miscellaneous expenses incident to the administration of the Organized Reserves, including the maintenance and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles and purchase of 30 such vehicles (at a cost not exceeding \$625 each, including the value of a vehicle exchanged); for the actual and necessary expenses, or per diem in lieu thereof, at rates authorized by law, incurred by officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army traveling on duty in connection with the Organized Reserves; for expenses incident to the use, including upkeep and depreciation costs of supplies, equipment, and material furnished in accordance with law from stocks under the control of the War Department, except that not to exceed \$440,842 of this appropriation shall be available for expenditure by the Chief of the Air Corps for the production and purchase of new airplanes and their equipment, spare parts, and accessories; for transportation of baggage, including packing and crating, of reserve officers on active duty for not less than six months; for the medical and hospital treatment of members of the Officers' Reserve Corps and of the Enlisted Reserve Corps who suffer personal injury or contract disease in line of duty, as provided by the act of April 26, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 10, secs. 451, 455), and for such other purposes in connection therewith as are authorized by the said act, including pay and allowances, subsistence, transportation, and burial expenses; in all, \$6,765,385, and no part of such total sum shall be available for any expense incident to giving flight training to any officer of the Officers' Reserve Corps unless he shall be found physically and professionally qualified to perform aviation service as an aviation pilot by such agency as the Secretary of War may designate: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$100,000 of this appropriation may be used for establishment and maintenance of divisional and regimental headquarters.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MAAS: On page 51, line 1, strike out "~~\$6,765,385~~" and insert in lieu thereof "\$7,265,385."

Mr. BARBOUR. How much does that add?

Mr. MAAS. Five hundred thousand dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] is recognized.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, in the 1931 appropriation the breakdown of the Budget shows the estimate \$7,042,362. The appropriation was \$6,542,362, which was \$500,000 less, the difference being the carry-over from 1930 of \$500,000, which was available during the past fiscal year. It was, in fact, available until December 31, 1931. However, that money was not spent. It was available for the organized reserves, but it was not used. Apparently it has gone back into the Treasury. Why that money was not used we do not know.

The answer will be made, "What is the difference, the number of reserve officers were trained that it was expected would be trained and that Congress directed to be trained"? Actually they have shaved \$500,000 from what Congress apparently intended to be spent for reserve officers. They send the greatest number of reserve officers in the lowest grades. They are not training colonels and majors in the proper proportion of such officers, but they are sending second lieutenants and first lieutenants to be trained, because they can send the same number at much less expense; in other words, it will not cost as much money to train the same number of officers if mostly only lower grades are sent. Furthermore, if a war came along we would have only the lower grades coming in as officers and the Regular Army would jump in and you would find Regular Army second lieutenants and first lieutenants becoming majors and lieutenant colonels and colonels. They are shaving off that money by sending as many second lieutenants to the reserve officers' training schools as possible. That money was made available by Congress to be spent for the Organized Reserves. It was not spent for it.

The American Legion has a committee which has gone into this matter thoroughly, and it believes that we should train 26,000 reserve officers per year. If you reinstate in the appropriation the \$500,000 which was available and should have been spent last year for the Organized Reserves, we can train the 26,000 who ought to be trained this next year.

The plea will be made that this year of all years we should not talk about increasing the amount. It is not increasing it. It is the money that Congress made available and it was not spent.

This is one year when the pacifists will glory in the opportunity to try to destroy the national defense on the plea of economy. At the same time, never was it more necessary to have Organized Reserves. Our philosophy of government is against a strong, permanent military establishment. I am against a large army and a great navy, but the greatest defense any nation can have is a well-organized civilian reserve. It is not militarism. Our standing Army could not defend New York City. We have to depend on the reserves. The people of the United States think they have national defense. They think they have it in the Organized Reserves. It is our duty to give it to them. This \$500,000 which Congress said should be spent for Organized Reserves we are asking be put back, and then that it be spent for that purpose.

Mr. HUDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. HUDSON. We did give them \$500,000 and they did not use it.

Mr. MAAS. That is correct; they did not use it.

Mr. HUDSON. Why did they not use it?

Mr. MAAS. Because they sent the junior officers to training camp instead of sending the proper proportion of senior officers.

Mr. HUDSON. Would they not make the same failure again?

Mr. MAAS. It is up to us to see that they do not.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then the gentleman believes that if the original provision in the defense act had been continued, providing that the reserve force should not receive any higher salary than that of captain, the condition that the department is now in would not prevail?

Mr. MAAS. Certainly. In addition to that, the Regular Army officer when he travels gets 8 cents a mile. The reserve officer gets 4 cents. If a reserve officer goes any distance, his Pullman and meals cost him more than he has received. But we are not complaining of that.

The Regular Army officer who goes there to train him gets 3 cents. These reserve officers who are willing to devote their time to this training and are willing to give up their vacations in order to secure it should not be denied that training, and yet the War Department's own records show that 1,820 officers applied for training but were denied training because the War Department said they lacked the funds. As a matter of fact, they had ample funds available as I have shown, all the time, and the denial of active training to these officers who were willing and anxious to take it was not in good faith when they were turned down on the excuse "of lack of funds." This argument particularly met a large number of requests for active two weeks' duty by officers in many of the senior grades. If another war ever does come it will have to be the Organized Reserves and trained civilians who will in the most part be called upon to defend the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say in regard to this \$500,000 that was supposed to have been left over and unexpended that there is a table in the hearings, from which it would appear that there was \$500,000 of a carry-over from the year 1930 which was not used in 1931. We have inquired of the War Department and received the actual facts in regard to that, and in that connection I want to make this statement: We appropriated in 1931 \$6,542,362. There was an unexpended balance from 1930, available in 1931, of \$407,999. It was not \$500,000, but it was \$407,999. The total available for 1931 was \$6,950,361. This bill proposes for 1932 \$6,765,385, which is an apparent decrease of \$184,976, but we have an entirely different situation in 1932 than during the year 1931 for this reason: Owing to the lack of vacancies in the Regular Army it was not possible to take the graduates of the Army flying school into the Regular Army in the usual and normal way that they do each year. It was necessary in order to hold some of those men to place them with the Regular Army as reserve flying officers. Therefore that took a considerable amount of money, which will not be required for that purpose in 1932. Eliminating the expense they are having this year and which they will not have to the same extent in 1932, there is an actual increase in this bill over the appropriations for 1931. Even considering this \$500,000 mentioned by the gentleman from Minnesota, but which is actually a little over \$400,000, we have an actual increase of \$19,366 for the year 1932.

Besides this the committee in this bill has recommended an increase in the Budget estimates of \$350,000 for the Organized Reserves. This is the biggest increase the committee has recommended in the bill for any purpose. It is proposed to train the same number of trainees in 1932 as were trained during the present fiscal year, and it is proposed to carry on the activities of the Organized Reserves just the same as they have been carried on, without any decrease or any curtailment. We felt that if we did this during these times of threatened deficits and reduced income of the Government nobody could complain. It is fair treatment. It is as fair as anybody can ask, and we are not neglecting the reserves. They are well taken care of.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] said they wanted to train 26,000 trainees. If you will read the statement of Major Lee, of the Regular Army, who is on duty

with the reserves, and to my mind is the best informed man in the United States on the Organized Reserves, a man who has made a study of this organization, you will find that he states that the most the Regular Army can train of the Organized Reserves is 24,000, and in order to do this they will have to have improved methods of training over those they have at the present time.

So, taking all these things into consideration, gentlemen, there can be no doubt—

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. How many did they train?

Mr. BARBOUR. Of the 15-day trainees, somewhere between 20,000 and 21,000.

Mr. COLLINS. Twenty-two thousand three hundred and ninety-three.

Mr. BARBOUR. That is the total number, including more than 15-day trainees and those with the Air Corps.

Mr. BEEDY. Will the gentleman yield to me right there?

Mr. BARBOUR. Just let me finish this statement.

In addition to this twenty thousand and some odd that go to the 15-day training camps, we are sending something like 500 to longer periods of active training with the Army. We are sending 272 or 273 for one year of training with the Regular Army Air Corps as reserve flying officers, and the committee has recommended money in the bill to restore the average number of flying hours to the number that they have had during the present year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes in order to answer a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. BARBOUR. It seems to me the reserves are being very fairly treated in this bill.

I now yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. BEEDY. I understand the gentleman from California to say that the position of Major Lee is that at present under the methods of training that we are pursuing it is a physical and practical impossibility to train more than 20,000 reserve officers.

Mr. BARBOUR. Twenty-four thousand.

Mr. BEEDY. And we are training now 21,000.

Mr. BARBOUR. Let me get the exact statement of Major Lee as it appears in the hearings, so there can be no misunderstanding about his position.

Mr. BEEDY. The only point I wanted to bring out is that Major Lee's statement seems to imply that our methods of training are antiquated, and so at present we train only 21,000, that with difficulty it would be possible to train 24,000 only in case we adopted new methods of training. However, the demand of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] and others for whom he speaks is that we train 26,000.

Mr. BARBOUR. I would not say the methods of training are antiquated, but we have a Regular Army of a certain size, and the Regular Army has to provide for the training of the reserves. It has to go to the citizens' military training camps to train the trainees there, and the Regular Army has its own training in the summer time; and with all these duties Major Lee says they can take 24,000 trainees as a maximum if they adopt improved methods in giving such training.

Mr. BEEDY. Does Major Lee say as to whether it would be better for us, as a matter of public policy and more in accord with the spirit of the national defense act, to train 24,000 or 26,000 reserve officers?

Mr. BARBOUR. As I recall, Major Lee did not pass judgment on that.

Mr. BEEDY. Is not that the issue?

Mr. BARBOUR. He was giving his version of the capacity of the Regular Army to handle this training.

Mr. COLLINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. BEEDY. Just a minute. This matter ought to be cleared up. Do you want these men who are writing us and telegraphing us to get money to train 26,000 officers to understand that Major Lee has made a plea of confession and avoidance—

Mr. BARBOUR. No.

Mr. BEEDY (continuing). Implying that it might be well to train 26,000 but that because of the methods which we employ that is a practical impossibility.

Mr. BARBOUR. Nothing of the kind. Major Lee is a very fine officer and he does not make pleas of confession and avoidance, but says what he thinks.

Mr. BEEDY. I thought not. Then I think the gentleman ought to make that clear.

Mr. BARBOUR. I am giving the facts as they were presented to our committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California may have five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWAIN. I would like to ask the gentleman from California whether his understanding of the statement of this officer is that it simply could not be done or that it is impolitic or unnecessary to be done?

Mr. BARBOUR. Oh, the statement meant to give the proper kind of training. I suppose they could take 100,000 to camp, but what Major Lee had in mind was providing the proper kind of training.

Mr. McSWAIN. Does that square with the ideas of the gentleman's committee and the common sense of the situation? There may be a question as to the wisdom, as to the necessity, and as to the propriety and as to the financial ability, but what would become of the country if war should break out, if in peace time in the whole year we could train but 21,000 officers already partially trained—where would we be if war should burst out as it did in 1917, when in the first training camps we must have had over 25,000 men?

Mr. BARBOUR. Let me read Major Lee's last statement:

Mr. BARBOUR. Let me ask you a question here. On page 34, Major, you have referred to your statement last year that you could train 21,000.

Major LEE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARBOUR. And that to train more by the same system meant that either standards of training must go down or the Regular Army's capacity for training must be increased. Does that figure still stand?

Major LEE. That figure still stands if you follow that old system which was then in effect, but we have introduced two or three new ideas here by which we could train them without further overloading our depleted Regular Army units.

Mr. BARBOUR. Is it making any difference in the number that you can train?

Major LEE. Yes, sir. We did train more than 21,000 total last year, but we did not do it under the old system that we had been operating for eight years.

Mr. BARBOUR. How many can you train under the present system?

Major LEE. These new schemes are in process of development so I can not tell you definitely. I would not like to say we can train more than about 24,000 by using all these new ideas.

Mr. McSWAIN. If that is the case, somebody needs to devise a new method of training. Let him devise method No. 2. No. 1 pulled us up from 22,000 to 24,000, and No. 2 may pull us up farther. I would like to understand what would be the idea of the further training camps if that comes from the General Staff.

Mr. BARBOUR. That relates only to the Army's ability to give proper training.

Mr. McSWAIN. And yet at the training camps in 1917 they must have trained over 25,000, and we only had an Army officer personnel of 5,000, and we now have 12,000.

Mr. BARBOUR. That was more like a citizens' training camp. The reserves receive a different kind of training.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. I yield.

Mr. SLOAN. What was the number of officers trained during the last year—that is, how many colonels and how many majors?

Mr. BARBOUR. In answer to the gentleman, I will insert this table from the hearings.

It will be noted in the following table that the 86 per cent of the total number trained were captains and lieutenants.

Distribution by grade

	General officer	Colonel	Lieutenant colonel	Major	Captain	First lieutenant	Second lieutenant	Total	Per cent of grand total
14-day trainees.....	6	223	824	2,043	4,121	6,185	7,868	21,270	95.0
More than 14 days.....	1	18	51	45	153	268	587	1,123	5.0
Grand total.....	7	241	875	2,088	4,274	6,453	8,455	22,393	100.0
Per cent of total trained.....		1.1	3.9	9.3	19.1	28.8	37.8	100.0	

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a good thing for the House to get the whole picture before us. We have 101,382 reserve officers. There are two methods of training these men. One is by correspondence courses and the other is by 14-day camps.

Now, a large number of these 101,000 officers will take no training whatever. They do absolutely nothing and the War Department does not drop them, in spite of the fact that they take no training, unless they have failed to take the training for a period of five years.

Mr. HUDSON. Do not they even take training by correspondence?

Mr. COLLINS. No; no training at all. The result is that Major Lee testified that not more than 77,000 of these men are taking any training at all. Of this 77,000, 51,000 are combat officers and 26,000 are noncombat officers. They are politicians, newspaper men, merchants, and that class of people that would never get into a war in the event that we had one.

Therefore, at best we have in this outfit—and certainly Major Lee has given the best picture possible—we have in this outfit not over 51,000 active combat reserve officers.

Now, the War Department's idea is that these men ought to be trained every third year at camp. One-third of 51,000 men would be 17,000 men per year.

Let us see what we are actually doing.

We graduate into the Organized Reserves such numbers from the Reserve Officers' Training Corps as are fit to go into it. By this process we train annually 7,200 Reserve Officers' Training Corps officers. There are 11,891 reserve officers who get training with the National Guard annually. In addition to that, there are 22,393 provided for under this particular head, with the result that we train 41,500 civilian officers yearly. Practically the entire number of first-class officers available are given training. This was the number provided for as the bill was presented to the committee, but the committee went further than that and gave them \$350,000 additional. The War Department requested the amount they felt advisable for such training. Then the committee exercised its judgment and increased that amount by \$350,000. Now, it is proposed in the House that in addition to the \$350,000 which the committee has authorized above the War Department estimates there be added \$500,000 more. If we are honestly after military

defense, the only way we can provide it is not by more khaki, not by more uniforms, but by arming the men in our Military Establishment with modern fighting machinery. If you add to your personnel, if you make the appropriations for personnel constantly urged upon us, then you find yourselves in the attitude of being unable to properly equip the Army with modern fighting implements, and you are against military defense when you propose such measures as this rather than for it.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment. As far back as I can remember within my term of service here I have had letters and telegrams each year, urging me to come here and prevail on the committee in considering the appropriations for the War Department to appropriate more money for the training of more reserve officers. There has always been a dispute as to whether 4,000 or 5,000 more reserve officers should be provided for in training. The statement has been read here to-day of Major Lee, who says that if you are going to train more reserve officers either one of two things must happen. You must either lower the standard of training or you must increase the facilities of the Regular Army for training. The real issue, then, it seems, is not whether we shall train 26,000 or 20,000 reserve officers; it is not a question of numbers, but it is a question of what kind of training we are going to afford the men we call in for training.

I think these men who send us these telegrams and who write these letters—and they are public-spirited men interested in the reserves and their proper training—instead of continually besieging us with flat statements that we ought to provide more money for the training of more reserve officers ought to go further. They ought to determine on a policy which they themselves favor and let us know whether they are satisfied with the standard of training which the number of men who are now trained are getting and whether they desire to cut the standard of training and train more men, or take the other alternative and urge us to see that the Regular Army appropriation be increased in order to enable the Regular Army to set up machinery for thoroughly training more reserve officers.

Until these men who besiege us with telegrams and letters—and that is their right, I am not complaining about it—make it clear to me, as one Member of this House, which of the two alternatives they prefer I confess I am at a loss to know what to urge upon this committee in this regard.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEEDY. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. This Organized Reserves appropriation has been one of the most difficult things that this committee has had to handle. Two years ago we asked the Secretary of War to have a study made of the whole Organized Reserves, so that we could get some definite information in regard to it. Major Lee undertook this study. He spent a year upon it. He is a very intelligent, a very competent officer. He came last year before our committee and gave us the first really complete statement that we ever had, covering the whole organization of the Organized Reserves. It is going through a process of change. They have prescribed new methods of promotion in the Organized Reserves. They are dividing them into an assigned and unassigned list. Some are keeping up their work to qualify them for additional and advanced training, and they are put onto the assigned list.

They are getting men on the assigned list who are willing to work and go ahead and do the work of the Organized Reserves as intended. It is going through that process now, and 1933, I believe it was, that Major Lee said would be the zero hour of the Organized Reserves, because of this difference in method and plan they are now trying to bring into effect.

Mr. BEEDY. I do not think we should minimize the importance of the Organized Reserves. They are a splendid body of men, and when we get into trouble we have to turn to them. I, for one, would like to see as many reserve officers adequately trained as is reasonably possible. I think we should live up to the spirit of the national defense act.

Mr. BARBOUR. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BEEDY. But I can not appropriate money here by simply saying, "Let us train 26,000 men instead of 20,000," when a man of Major Lee's standing says that we have not the facilities to do it unless we are content to cut the training, to cut the standard of training, and train more of them, but less effectively. It seems to me that a very serious question of choice between two alternatives is first presented for decision. I, myself, should like to hear further from the Organized Reserves in this respect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BEEDY: On page 51, in line 7, strike out the figures "\$100,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$190,000."

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in an attempt to clarify another situation.

I have before me a letter from a man in my district for whom I have very high regard. He is a man who is very much interested in the proper training of our reserves; a man of military training and experience. He says that if we are going to have a defense act, we ought to live up to it; and if we are not, we ought to stop making gestures and cut it out altogether. He tells me it is a mistake to cut \$90,000 from the reserve division and regimental headquarters and appropriate only \$100,000; that there should be a total of \$190,000 appropriated for this purpose.

I talked with the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. BARBOUR, of California, about this, and he said: "Mr. BEEDY, that \$90,000 is in the bill. It is all in there. It is in the \$6,765,000 item that you will find in line 1, page 51."

Now, this \$100,000 reads:

For the establishment and maintenance of divisional and regimental headquarters.

The gentleman from California said:

In last year's appropriation bill \$190,000 was carried "for establishment, maintenance, and operation of division and regimental headquarters."

And he added:

This year the \$90,000 for operation is in another item and the \$100,000 is only for the establishment and maintenance of regimental headquarters.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEEDY. I yield.

Mr. BARBOUR. I am afraid the gentleman misunderstood me. The language is exactly the same as it was in last year's bill.

Mr. BEEDY. That is what I find upon comparing last year's bill with the present bill.

Mr. BARBOUR. The \$190,000 is carried in this bill, but in the general appropriation in the line above, at the top of the page. It is exactly the same as was carried for the year 1931, the present fiscal year, but of the \$190,000 the proviso is put in that not to exceed \$100,000 of it may be used for establishment and maintenance of division and regimental headquarters.

They maintain a lot of offices and headquarters throughout the country. This limits the amount of expense for those offices to \$100,000. That is all it does.

Mr. BEEDY. Where is the \$90,000, and what may that be used for?

Mr. BARBOUR. The entire project which is included in the total appropriation is "establishment, maintenance, and operation of Organized Reserves' headquarters," and the appropriation is \$190,000. It is in the bill.

Mr. BEEDY. May I ask the gentleman this question: What would you spend \$90,000 for in operating headquarters that you would not spend \$100,000 for in the maintenance and establishment of them?

Mr. BARBOUR. Stationery, telegrams, telephone service, postage, equipment, street-car fares, and many other things.

Mr. BEEDY. Would that not come under "maintenance"?

Mr. BARBOUR. No. It comes under "operation."

Mr. BEEDY. I would like you to make clear the distinction between "maintenance" and "operation" as the words are employed in this particular connection.

Mr. BARBOUR. "Maintenance" is rental and incidental expenses, and probably light and things like that.

Mr. BEEDY. Well, to save time and to get it clear in the RECORD, let me ask the gentleman from California this question: There is no question but that \$190,000 is available in this appropriation bill for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of divisional headquarters, only it does not appear in this one item. Is there any doubt about that?

Mr. BARBOUR. There is no question whatever. This proviso simply limits the \$100,000 to the establishment and maintenance. The \$90,000 goes into the operation, or more than \$90,000, if necessary.

Mr. BEEDY. I thank the gentleman. I withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

No portion of the appropriation shall be expended for the pay of a reserve officer on active duty for a longer period than 15 days, except such as may be detailed for duty with the War Department General Staff under section 3a and section 5 (b) of the Army reorganization act approved June 4, 1920 (U. S. C., title 10, secs. 26, 37), or who may be detailed for courses of instruction at the general or special service schools of the Army, or who may be detailed for duty as instructors at civilian military training camps, appropriated for in this act, or who may be detailed for duty with tactical units of the Air Corps, as provided in section 37a of the Army reorganization act approved June 4, 1920 (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 369): *Provided*, That the pay and allowances of such additional officers and nurses of the Medical Reserve Corps as are required to supplement the like officers and nurses of the Regular Army in the care of beneficiaries of the United States Veterans' Bureau treated in Army hospitals may be paid from the funds allotted to the War Department by that bureau under existing law.

Mr. STAFFORD. I move to strike out the last word, to inquire as to the number of doctors and nurses in the Medical Reserve Corps who are used in supplementing those in the Regular Army, as provided for in this proviso.

Mr. BARBOUR. Does the gentleman mean those that are used in the Regular Army?

Mr. STAFFORD. Here is an authorization that the pay and allowances of such additional officers and nurses of the Medical Reserve Corps as are required to supplement like officers and nurses of the Regular Army shall be paid from certain funds allotted to the War Department. My query is as to how many officers and nurses of the Medical Reserve Corps are in service in connection with the various hospitals of the Veterans' Bureau.

Mr. BARBOUR. I can not state the number to the gentleman, because I do not believe there is any breakdown of that in the hearings.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman does not know whether it is the policy of the War Department to assign officers connected with the Medical Reserve Corps to service in the hospitals of the Veterans' Bureau?

Mr. BARBOUR. It is to a certain extent, I understand, but to what extent I could not say.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would say it is to a very limited extent, and I think the medical officers of the Army would be mostly occupied with service connected with the hospitals under direct charge of the War Department.

Mr. BARBOUR. My recollection of it is that they are used to a very limited extent.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then the further query arises in my mind whether all the medical officers in the Veterans' Bureau hospitals are connected with the Medical Reserve Corps?

Mr. BARBOUR. No; I understand not. Many of them are civilian doctors who are employed in the Veterans' Bureau hospitals.

Mr. STAFFORD. So that it is not a sine qua non that for employment in the Veterans' Bureau hospital they have to be first identified with the Medical Reserve Corps?

Mr. BARBOUR. No. A great many are civilians.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 15593) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

DROUGHT RELIEF

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the country is presented with a condition of distress among farmers which demands candid, fair, and merciful consideration. I know there are a great many times when we are asked to appropriate money under conditions like these when it is a debatable question because there is, perhaps, some doubt as to the magnitude of the suffering. But I think it must be conceded that we are confronted at this time with a condition of distress that is almost nation-wide. I believe the greatest emergency that ever faced this country in time of peace is confronting it now. In my State, and particularly my district in southeastern Oklahoma, there are many pitiful cases necessitating instant and constant relief.

There arose early in the discussion a plea to extend relief in the form of loans for the purchase of human food as well as for the purchase of seed for crops and feed for animals. Secretary Hyde came forward with his \$25,000,000 recommendation and with the further recommendation that the proceeds of the loan should be used only for feed for work animals. The Senate increased the amount from \$25,000,000 to \$60,000,000 and included food for man as well as beast. The President and his forces opposed it and a compromise of \$45,000,000, eliminating food for man, was reached. The Caraway amendment providing for an appropriation of \$15,000,000 to buy food to relieve human suffering will be killed through the opposition of the administration. President Hoover takes the position that not one dollar should be loaned or given to farmers for the purchase of food.

In substance, President Hoover said the Red Cross could take care of all distress in the drought area, and is actually doing so. Judge Payne, national chairman of the Red Cross, comes to the President's rescue with the same position. But evidence and sentiment to the contrary seem to have gathered, and in order not to be outdone and in order to weaken the demand for a Federal appropriation for food they join in a call to the people for \$10,000,000, which, in my opinion, under existing conditions, is most undesirable.

Personally I believe that if President Hoover and Judge Payne would circulate among the common people for a few hours they might stop fiddling while the country starves. Will Rogers says: "I don't want to discourage Mr. Mellon and his carefully balanced Budget, but you let this country get hungry and they are going to eat, no matter what happens to Budgets, income taxes, or Wall Street values. Washington mustn't forget who rules when it comes to a show-down."

In my opinion this is a bad time to put on a Red Cross drive. The whole Nation is suffering the worst depression in history. People have already been taxed to the limit in trying to take care of local conditions and that is the very reason why they are asking the Government to bear its share of the burden.

I congratulate the Red Cross for the good it is doing and has done, also for the large amount of money that it holds in reserve. This undoubtedly shows good management, but what better use could be made of that reserve than to relieve starvation in the face of such a crisis? The gener-

osity of the people has been the life of the Red Cross. They will be willing to make it up when they are able, but do not ask them to raise \$10,000,000 now unless it be entirely from the millionaire class. The Government, with scarcely a whimper, recently appropriated \$15,000,000 to build a bridge across the Potomac in the very shadow of two other fine bridges. This was done to beautify Washington. Why can it not be done as a loan to feed starving children?

We are not asking that this money be appropriated as a charity gift. There are two distinct classes of people needing food. One is the very poor that we have with us always but who are in desperate circumstances now. These should be taken care of through charity and the Red Cross. The other class consists of proud, formerly prosperous farmers, mostly cotton farmers in my district, who have suffered one crop failure after another due to floods, hail, boll weevil, and drought, and as a result are without anything with which to subsist. This is the class which should be reached by Government loans for food. They do not want charity. They want to pay back every dollar they get with interest and can do it if given time.

We have had many bank failures and they went down in defense of agriculture. The banks that do exist have loaned to their extremity. Because of these bank failures thousands of good, honest farmers have no place to borrow money for food and seed.

I have many letters and telegrams from all over my district. One letter from an outstanding citizen says:

It looks as though 50 per cent of our citizenship will have to be fed, and that immediately. My dear sir, this condition is more than serious. I have met people in this work who could not keep back the tears, and without question, there has got to be a broadcast country relief.

From the telegrams the general tenor is found in the following:

Most all our best farmers need help to make crop. They are good, law-abiding citizens who will starve rather than make a demonstration or demands. They do not want donations from charitable institutions. They ask for loans and expect to repay every dollar. Our banks and merchants are not able to make further advances. Quick action needed on appropriation to meet this deplorable condition.

Mr. Speaker, I tell you the situation is desperate, and if something is not done, and done speedily, the performance in Arkansas will be repeated in Oklahoma.

I have been urging this relief in the belief that our farmers must get back on their feet again before there can be any substantial return of normally prosperous conditions in the drought-stricken territory.

When such conditions as I speak of occur in foreign countries, Congress has not hesitated to appropriate money to give relief. I am not criticizing the Congress because they have taken such action in the past. But it seems to me it would be much more reasonable for us to relieve human suffering at our very doorstep.

The thing that puzzles me is why some of the ardent supporters of these relief plans to help peoples of other nations are now the most bitter opponents of this relief legislation in behalf of the farmers of America. I would be very glad for any of those who favored these foreign-relief measures, and now oppose the relief bills for our own people, to take the floor and explain. Very few people realize just how generous with other nations has been the attitude of some Members of Congress who are now opposing these emergency loans.

I am pleading for the honest yeomanry of the country, the fine patriotic men and women who have supported their country in time of war, who love it and sustain it and contribute to its strength and glory in time of peace, who are in want this day. Hail and storm have ruined their crops in some sections. The drought has withered the plants in their fields in other sections. Let us go to their rescue now.

These things that are upon them are things over which they have no control. Providence has done this; and certainly this the greatest Nation of all the earth will not deny these people the necessities of life. I am not pleading for the money kings and the steel kings (they will be able

to get by), but the people in the common walks of life who are looking hopefully to their Government to aid them when nothing else under Heaven will aid them. They can get aid nowhere else.

And now in this time of their grave troubles and deep distress they stand at the door of their great and noble Government and ask for bread. Will the answer be a stone? O my friends, when you break the morale of an upstanding, patriotic, honest yeomanry, what then? I commend the following poem to your prayerful consideration:

Princes and lords may flourish or may fade—
A breath can make them, as a breath has made;
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
When once destroy'd, can never be supplied.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HALE (at the request of Mr. WASON), on account of illness.

To Mr. BLAND, for to-day, on account of illness in family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 15, 1931, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Thursday, January 15, 1931, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Navy Department appropriation bill.

Legislative appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

(10.30 a. m.)

To define more clearly the authority of consular officers of the United States in certain respects. (H. R. 3827.)

To amend section 4580 of the Revised Statutes of the United States respecting the liability of vessels for the care of seamen guilty of certain offenses. (H. R. 3828.)

To amend section 4591 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to provide more adequately for the discharge, maintenance, and repatriation of seamen in foreign ports. (H. R. 3829.)

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

(10 a. m.)

To provide for the purchase or construction of buildings for post-office stations, branches, and garages, and for other purposes. (H. R. 13566.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

774. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill to authorize the Secretary of War to direct the attendance of personnel and animals of the Regular Army as participants in the Olympic games, and authorize the expenses incident to such attendance and participation to be charged to appropriations for the support of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

775. A letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. to the Congress of the United States for the year 1930; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

776. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed provisions to be added to the estimate of appropriation for the American

Battle Monuments Commission as contained in the Budget for the fiscal year 1932 (H. Doc. No. 717); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. TEMPLE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. J. Res. 462. A joint resolution to further provide for defraying the expenses of the International Water Commission, United States and Mexico; without amendment (Rept. No. 2268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILLIAMSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 15267. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the cancellation, under certain conditions, of patents in fee simple to Indians for allotments held in trust by the United States"; with amendment (Rept. No. 2269). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ZIHLMAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 15496. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to transfer to the trustees of Howard University title to certain property in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2270). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TEMPLE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 15608. A bill to authorize the modification of the boundary line between the Panama Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2271). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8993. A bill for the relief of John Baba; without amendment (Rept. No. 2263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8997. A bill for the relief of the Chicago, North Shore & Milwaukee Railroad Co., of Highwood, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2264). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9837. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Mirabelli; without amendment (Rept. No. 2265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 13086. A bill for the relief of Alexander H. Bright; without amendment (Rept. No. 2266). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SANDERS of Texas: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 6368. A bill for the relief of Lieut. William J. Nowinski; with amendment (Rept. No. 2267). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15749) granting a pension to Annie E. Leavitt, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 16151) to amend the naturalization law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LUDLOW: A bill (H. R. 16152) to amend section 309 of the World War Veterans' act, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 16153) to provide for the closing of barber shops on Sunday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 16154) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of

a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Decatur, Nebr.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESLICK: A bill (H. R. 16155) granting the consent of Congress to Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Danville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 16156) for the exchange of lands adjacent to national forests in Colorado; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ABERNETHY: A bill (H. R. 16157) to amend the revenue act of 1926 by reducing the tax on cigars, cigarettes, and tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN: A bill (H. R. 16158) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire for experimental purposes certain lands or interest in lands in Bradford and Clay Counties, Fla., and elsewhere, for research purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEMPLE: A bill (H. R. 16159) authorizing an appropriation of the sum of \$15,000 to defray the expenses of the Pan American Commercial Conference, to be held in Washington, D. C., in 1931; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16160) authorizing an appropriation to defray the expenses of participation by the United States in the World's Grain Exhibition and Conference to be held in Canada in 1932; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16161) authorizing an appropriation to pay the share of the Government of the United States in expenses incurred by the Governments of Great Britain and Japan incident to an undertaking to deport enemy aliens from China to Australia during the World War; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HILL of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 16162) to extend hospital and home facilities to veterans of the Confederate Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRUNNER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 465) to provide for the preparation and distribution of pamphlets containing the Constitution of the United States and Declaration of Independence printed in foreign language and in English; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. FULMER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 466) authorizing the appropriation of \$10,000,000 to be expended by the American National Red Cross for the purchase and distribution of cotton goods, cloth, and garments among the unemployed and in drought-stricken areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 16163) granting an increase of pension to Angeline Dille; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 16164) granting a pension to Thomas Eubank; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16165) granting a pension to Chester E. Stevenson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COOKE: A bill (H. R. 16166) granting an increase of pension to Frank A. Klein; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRADDOCK: A bill (H. R. 16167) granting a pension to Martha Kasinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 16168) for the relief of John P. Larimore; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 16169) granting a pension to Amanda Riddell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 16170) granting a pension to Ellen Scully; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 16171) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Knight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16172) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Griffith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 16173) granting a pension to Louis Garner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL: A bill (H. R. 16174) granting a pension to Maude Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16175) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 16176) granting an increase of pension to Adah Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16177) granting an increase of pension to Veturia H. Dugan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16178) granting a pension to Samuel Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 16179) for the relief of Laura B. Hayes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 16180) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Roush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 16181) granting a pension to Nellie Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 16182) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Hiskett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. McCORMICK of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 16183) for the relief of Capt. Jacob M. Pearce, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MOREHEAD: A bill (H. R. 16184) for the relief of Mary E. McGerr; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 16185) granting an increased annuity to Thomas A. Kelly; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. RAGON: A bill (H. R. 16186) for the relief of W. Eugene Butler; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 16187) granting a pension to Eudora Elkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SEIBERLING: A bill (H. R. 16188) for the relief of the Samuel Puff Bailey; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 16189) granting an increase of pension to Agnes C. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 16190) for the relief of G. F. and E. M. Snyder; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TEMPLE: A bill (H. R. 16191) authorizing the payment of an indemnity to Demitrio Valle, a Nicaraguan citizen, on account of losses resulting from a bombing operation by a United States Marine Corps airplane; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16192) to authorize an appropriation for the payment of an indemnity to N. J. Moosa, a citizen of Great Britain, for personal injuries sustained as the result of a collision between a United States Marine Corps truck and a brokers' trap in which he was riding; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16193) to authorize an appropriation for the payment of an indemnity to Salvador Buitrago Diaz, a Nicaraguan citizen, for damages alleged to have been done to his property by United States marines on February 6, 1921; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16194) for the relief of Enrique Klinghoffer and Br. Rappaccioli; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16195) to authorize an appropriation for the payment of an indemnity to Ling Mau Mau, a citizen of China, for personal injuries received by him which resulted in the loss of his right arm as the result of a collision between a United States naval vessel and a Chinese junk, and for medical expenses incurred as a result of the injury; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16196) for the relief of Janet Hardcastle Ross, a Canadian citizen; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16197) for the relief of the widow and the children of Justo Calderon, a native Nicaraguan, who

was killed by a member of the United States naval forces; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 16198) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Opdycke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16199) granting an increase of pension to Mary Buhner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 16200) granting a pension to Caddie Nichols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 16201) for the relief of Maj. A. H. Willis and Capt. William N. Skyles, Finance Department, United States Army, and Capt. Benjamin J. Holt, jr., retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WARREN: A bill (H. R. 16202) granting a pension to Susie A. Harmon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 16203) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, consider, and render judgment on the claims of George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd against the United States in respect of certain ships taken during the World War by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 16204) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Dalsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8580. Petition of veterans of all wars (Akron, Ohio) urging the passage of the Patman bill for the immediate payment of the full face value of veterans' adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8581. Petition of American-Chinese Protective DeJure Association, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging Congress to repeal or modify any acts, such as the Chinese exclusion act, or any other acts that are unjust and discriminating against the Chinese people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8582. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of residents of New York State, urging the passage of House bill 7884 providing for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8583. Also, petition of Associated Cooperage Industries of America, urging the amendment of the Volstead Act so as to permit the manufacture of light wines and beer, and the prompt issuance yearly of permits for medicinal whisky, as such an amendment would serve to provide employment for many thousands of men in the wooden-barrel industry throughout the United States, additional thousands in the production of raw materials, provide a source of cash income for numbers of farmers owning timber tracts and wood lots whose incomes have been affected by the drought, and such an amendment would also stimulate the production of steel and wire as well as other cooperage supplies, machinery, and equipment, contribute to increased railroad tonnage, and in many ways help to alleviate the present conditions of unemployment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8584. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the National Guard Association of New York, urging Congress to promptly pass House bill 12918, introduced by Representative SPEAKS; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8585. By Mr. FOSS: Resolutions for the stabilization of employment adopted by the members of the Leominster (Mass.), Fitchburg (Mass.), Southbridge (Mass.), Athol (Mass.), and Webster (Mass.) Aeries, Fraternal Order of Eagles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8586. Also, petition of Boston (Mass.) Local, Journeymen Stone Cutters' Association of North America, for the use of local stone in public buildings, the use of local labor in preparing stone, the payment of prevailing local wages, and the limitation of working hours to eight hours a day and five days a week; also wire of Building Trades Council of Boston, Mass., indorsing this petition; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

8587. Also, letter from New England Antivivisection Society, of Boston, Mass., urging passage of House bill 7884 for the exemption of dogs from vivisection; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8588. Also, petition of 40 residents of the third congressional district of Massachusetts, urging passage of House bill 7884 providing for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8589. By Mr. JENKINS: Petition signed by about 200 citizens, business men, and veterans of Meigs County, Ohio, petitioning Congress to support the Patman bill for the immediate payment of the full face value of veterans' adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8590. Also, petition signed by 34 members of Feeney-Bennett Post, No. 128, of the American Legion of Middleport, Ohio, earnestly requesting a favorable vote on legislation before Congress providing for immediate payment of the full face value of veterans' adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8591. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of Mr. R. G. Hill, departmental chaplain, American Legion, Groesbeck, Tex., urging payment of adjusted-service certificates issued to World War veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8592. Also, petition of Jack C. Barnard, Wichita Falls, Tex., favoring a tariff on oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8593. By Mr. KINZER: Petition of Veterans' of Foreign Wars of Lancaster County, Pa., urging enactment of the bill providing for immediate payment of adjusted-compensation certificates in cash to the veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8594. By Mr. LEA: Petitions of 50 residents of San Anselmo, Marin County, Calif., urging passage of House bill 7884, providing for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8595. By Mr. MENGES: Petition of the Young Women's Christian Association, of Hanover, Pa., and the Lions Club, of York, Pa., asking Congress to so amend the Constitution of the United States as to count only citizens for congressional representation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8596. By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of sundry citizens of the fourth congressional district of Connecticut, urging the passage of House bill 7884, providing for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8597. By Mr. HARCOURT J. PRATT: Petition of M. A. Emerick, Edward J. Yerick, Ella Cooper, Roy Chittenden, Mrs. Henry Tegtmeier, Frank G. Yerick, Grace H. Austin, Jennie Emerick, Clara Zimmer, Minnie Schwarze, Kate Soder, Blanche H. Chittenden, and Carrie Krouse, all of Stottville, Columbia County, N. Y., praying for passage of House bill 7884, to exempt dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8598. By Mr. SHOTT of West Virginia: Memorial of Painter-Porroni Post, No. 1021, Veterans of Foreign Wars, urging the payment of adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8599. By Mr. STONE: Petition signed by Vera Binkley and others, urging the passage of House bill 7884, for the exemption of dogs from vivisection; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8600. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of J. Osburn Lewis, 29 West Pike Street, Canonsburg, Pa., in support of payment at this time of the adjusted-compensation of ex-service men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8601. By Mr. WOLVERTON of West Virginia: Petition of Shirley M. Eye, commercial instructor, Walton District High School, Walton, W. Va., and Homer H. May, principal of the same school, urging Congress to take favorable action on the Capper-Reed bill; to the Committee on Education.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 15, 1931

(Legislative day of Monday, January 5, 1931)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

PROVISO STRICKEN FROM RULE XVI

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I wish to submit a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield for that purpose?

Mr. MOSES. I do not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire declines to yield.

Mr. MOSES. The Committee on Rules is engaged in the preparation of a new edition of the Senate Manual. We find on page 20-B, in connection with the rule in reference to appropriation bills, this phrase:

Provided, That this rule shall not apply to the bill making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923.

I wish to ask unanimous consent to have the proviso stricken from the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Frazier	King	Shipstead
Barkley	George	La Follette	Shortridge
Bingham	Gillett	McGill	Simmons
Black	Glass	McKellar	Smith
Blaine	Glenn	McMaster	Smoot
Borah	Goff	McNary	Steiwer
Bratton	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Stephens
Brock	Gould	Morrison	Swanson
Brookhart	Hale	Morrow	Thomas, Idaho
Bulkeley	Harris	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Harrison	Norbeck	Townsend
Caraway	Hastings	Norris	Trammell
Carey	Hatfield	Nye	Tydings
Connally	Hawes	Oddie	Vandenberg
Copeland	Hayden	Partridge	Wagner
Couzens	Hebert	Patterson	Walcott
Cutting	Heflin	Pine	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Howell	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Davis	Johnson	Reed	Waterman
Deneen	Jones	Robinson, Ark.	Watson
Dill	Kean	Robinson, Ind.	Wheeler
Fess	Kendrick	Schall	Williamson
Fletcher	Keys	Sheppard	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses], which he will again state.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, in connection with the revision of the Senate Manual, which is being made by the Committee on Rules for the Seventy-second Congress, we find an archaic provision on page 20-B in the rule relating to appropriation bills, there being a proviso as follows:

Provided, That this rule shall not apply to the bill making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923.

I have asked unanimous consent that this proviso may be stricken from that rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PROPOSED CONSOLIDATION OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I desire to submit an inquiry to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses]. I have a resolution which is pending before the Committee on Rules with reference to the creation of a new committee to handle all veterans' affairs now handled by the Finance Committee and the Appropriations Committee, and also combining with it the Committee on Pensions. I want to ask the Senator what prospect there is of getting a report on that resolution?